

The Review of English Studies

VOL. III.—No. 12.

OCTOBER 1927.

ACT- AND SCENE-DIVISIONS IN THE PLAYS OF SHAKESPEARE: A REJOINDER TO SIR MARK HUNTER

By J. DOVER WILSON

SIR MARK HUNTER's article, printed in July 1926 by the editor of this review, did me the honour of singling out for attack an edition for the preparation of which I happen to be responsible on the textual side. One engaged in producing a new text of Shakespeare, on lines which seem to many revolutionary, necessarily exposes so lengthy and diverse a front to criticism that were he to attempt a reply to all, or even to the more weighty, attacks made upon him he would be kept too busy to continue his editorial work. Sir Mark Hunter, however, raises issues that I am constrained to take up, not so much in self-defence as because he seems to have overlooked one or two considerations which I felt ought to be placed on record, in the hope of their being useful to some future student prepared to institute a systematic and exhaustive examination of the available evidence on the question of act-divisions, an investigation which has never been undertaken, though it should not prove at all difficult to one who could afford the time to tackle it properly. I should perhaps add that I actually wrote most of the ensuing article in the summer of 1926, and that other and more importunate claims forced me to lay it aside unfinished for nearly a twelvemonth.

I

There is no difference of opinion between Sir Mark Hunter and myself on the matter of scene-divisions. Indeed, his statement of

the case corresponds closely with that on pp. 77-8 of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* in the "New Shakespeare" edition, which runs as follows :

On this sheet [*i.e.* the theatrical plot] the scene-divisions were marked by lines ruled across it, while occasionally act-divisions were also indicated in similar fashion. It is important to remember that these scene-divisions were theatrical and not literary in character—that is to say, they occurred when one group of players left the stage to make room for another, even when the action was continuous and the *mise en scène* unaltered. In a word, the rules across the "plot" were *exeunt omnes* lines.

I quote this not in order to set up any claim for priority of invention, but because Sir Mark's criticism of my position appears to be based entirely upon the Textual Introduction to the opening volume of the "New Shakespeare." Had he looked into the nine volumes that have since appeared, in which it has been possible to illustrate and expand many of the principles originally laid down, he could not have missed the passage just quoted, he would not have implicitly condemned me together with other editors since Capell for making a new scene halfway through *Measure for Measure*, III. 1,* and he might, I think, have been led to say more upon the interesting stage-direction "They sleepe all the Act," which appears at the end of Act III. in the Folio text of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. On the other hand, it is always satisfactory to find that a student working independently has arrived at the same conclusions as oneself. Sir Mark Hunter's agreement, therefore, as regards scene-division in Elizabethan texts is the more welcome.

II

The difference between us concerns act-division alone. Here, as Sir Mark Hunter points out, it is important to arrive at some idea of "the general practice of the Elizabethan stage, and of writers of plays during the Elizabethan period." As I have just said, the evidence on this question has never, so far as I know, been brought together, and until some diligent student sets about doing so, the rest of us are bound to rely upon general impressions based upon our knowledge of Elizabethan drama *in the original texts*. I emphasise these last words because the act-divisions found in modern reprints,

* The reference given in Sir M. Hunter's article is II.1, but the later act is clearly meant.

apart from facsimiles, are manifestly of no value as evidence. Now general impressions are notoriously treacherous, and to what different conclusions they may lead with different people is proved by the two principles which Sir Mark Hunter lays down at the beginning of his article, and which, he says, "the available evidence would, I believe, warrant." They are :

(i) All regular plays, whether written for performance in ordinary play-houses by professional or specially trained actors, or belonging to the academic variety, were normally constructed in accordance with a five-act plan. No other scheme of division, and no scheme without division, was recognised as normal.

(ii) Act-headings corresponding to act-divisions were regularly inserted in academic plays, and appear in a very large number, probably forming the majority, of stage-plays.

Speaking as one who has been reading Elizabethan plays in the original fairly consistently, if intermittently, for the last twenty-five years, I can only say that these two principles seem to me amazing, and that my general impression is almost exactly the reverse.

Three points, it will be noticed, are involved : the occurrence of act-divisions in the books, in manuscript or print, of the period ; the practice as regards act-pauses on the stage ; and the question whether Shakespeare himself constructed his plays according to a rhythm corresponding with the five-act plan. These are distinct, though of course closely related, problems, the first belonging to the bibliographical, the second to the theatrical, and the third to the dramatic sphere. We shall do well, therefore, to consider them separately. Let us begin with the evidence of the playbooks.

Sir Mark Hunter tells us that he has examined "two hundred odd copies of plays," and that he finds 70 per cent. of them conform to "the five-act scheme." He gives us no indication of the date of these plays or of the editions in which he examined them, and before his evidence can be accepted we have a right to assurance on both these points. There is reason for thinking, as we shall presently see, that theatrical custom, with Shakespeare's company at any rate, began to change during the second decade of the seventeenth century ; and in any event plays produced later than 1623 or even after the death of Shakespeare can hardly weigh as evidence in the same scale as those produced during the twenty years 1590-1610, when Shakespeare was himself an acting dramatist. Furthermore, only the original texts, as I have said, can be trusted

in this matter. Now it so happens that we have in the typographical facsimiles of the Malone Society a body of Elizabethan plays most of which fall within the limits just mentioned and which, written as they are by a number of different dramatists, should give one a very fair notion of the practice of the time as regards act-division. Apart from the volumes of *Collections*, the society up to the present (1926) has issued forty-nine texts. Five of these are early sixteenth-century interludes which lie outside the scope of the present inquiry, though it may be noticed in passing that none of them show act-divisions. Two, as being later than 1620, may be ruled out by the downward limit; they would as a matter of fact cancel each other out, since one is divided and the other is not. Five are unmistakably academic plays, having no possible connexion with the public stage, which we may also leave out of consideration seeing that it is common ground between Sir Mark Hunter and myself that such plays almost invariably followed the classical practice. One is a translation, apparently from the Greek, of the *Iphigenia*, and here it is curious to note no acts are found. Finally we are left with thirty-six dramas which were presumably written for the professional London companies, and fall within the period 1580-1620, one being earlier than 1590 and three later than 1610. Of these 36 plays, 9 are regularly divided according "to the five-act scheme," 4 contain act-divisions which are either imperfect or inaccurately marked, and no less than 23 afford no trace of any kind of division.*

These results tally pretty closely with Sir Edmund Chambers' summing up on the matter in his chapter on "The Printing of Plays," which Sir Mark Hunter strangely ignores. It is worth quoting at length.

In the early prints the beginnings of scenes are rarely marked, and the beginnings of acts are left unmarked to an extent which is rather surprising. The practice is by no means uniform, and it is possible to distinguish different tendencies in texts of different origin. The Tudor interludes and the early Elizabethan plays of the more popular type are wholly undivided, and there was probably no break in the continuity of the performances. Acts and scenes, which are the outward form of a method of construction derived from the academic analysis of Latin comedy and tragedy, make their appearance, with other notes of neo-classical influence, in the farces of the school of Udall, in the Court

* One or two begin with an "Actus primus, Scena prima," showing that the printer knew what belonged to a play, but the copy gives him no support, and no divisions follow.

tragedies, in translated plays, in Lyly's comedies, and in a few others belonging to the same milieu of scholarship. Ben Jonson and a few other later writers adopt them in printing plays of theatrical origin. *But the great majority of plays belonging to the public theatres continue to be printed without any divisions at all*, while plays from the private houses are ordinarily divided into acts but not into scenes, although the beginning of each act has usually some such heading as "Actus Primus, Scena Prima." This distinction corresponds to the greater significance of the act-interval in the performance of the boy-companies; but, as I have pointed out in an earlier chapter, it is difficult to suppose that the public theatres paid no regard to act-intervals, and one cannot therefore quite understand why neither the poets nor the book-keepers were in the habit of showing them in the play-house "originals" of plays. Had they been shown there, they would almost inevitably have got into the prints.*

In the face of all this Sir Mark Hunter is not likely to gain many adherents to his opinion that "the arrangement in five acts was regarded as normal." The evidence of the printed texts, so far from being decisively in his favour as he claims, leans heavily to the other side. Nevertheless, "it is difficult," Sir Edmund Chambers remarks, "to suppose that the public theatres paid no regard to act-intervals." Let us turn, then, from the printed play to stage-practice.

III

In regard to act-pauses Sir Edmund Chambers, in the passage just quoted, distinguishes two different traditions: (i) the popular tradition coming down from the interludes in which plays were "wholly undivided and there was probably no break in the continuity of the performances," and (ii) the academic tradition, which sprang up under the "neo-classical influence" in schools and at court and involved the five-act method of construction. In passing, it may be noted that this distinction, based upon a knowledge of stage-history which no living scholar can rival, disposes at once of Sir Mark Hunter's main objection to my position. It is absurd, he represents, to suppose "that Shakespeare, in an important matter, deliberately departed from principles of dramatic construction which were not only based on literary tradition, but were fully recognised in the practice of the contemporary stage. It is surely little more than a commonplace of criticism to insist that in matters relatively external, . . . Shakespeare was neither reformer nor innovator; that, on the contrary, he accepted traditions and conventions as he found them."

* *Elizabethan Stage*, iii. 199. (The italics are mine.)

I agree, of course. But the absurdity lies in Sir Mark Hunter's thesis rather than in mine. To the actor-dramatist, with "small Latin and less Greek," who belonged essentially to the popular theatrical tradition, it would be the five-act scheme that would seem newfangled, and if he "rejected the idea that plays should be divided into acts and scenes," it would be only because he was accustomed to the old ways and preferred them. Sir Mark Hunter's assumptions are founded upon a false historical perspective.

There is nothing, therefore, very startling in a theory that the conservative Shakespeare may have followed the traditions of the older and more popular dramaturgy. But did he do so as a matter of fact? May not the weight of the classical influence, the desire to be in the fashion, or the mere exigences of theatrical convenience have overborne his prejudices? The reply to such questions depends to a certain extent upon the interpretation we give to the scanty evidence concerning stage-practice in regard to act-pauses, evidence which Sir Edmund Chambers clearly finds puzzling and in strange conflict with that of the printed plays already examined. Yet Sir Edmund himself, I think, suggests a clue to the puzzle in the remark that while the popular tradition was followed in the main by the public playhouses, the academic tradition was naturally found in the private playhouses with their scholastic connexions, and that practice might vary even in the same playhouse from time to time or with different dramatists. The academic tradition seems to have been followed occasionally if not always, from the very beginning, in at least one popular London playhouse, viz. the Rose theatre, owned by the famous Henslowe, the house of the Admiral's men, a company led by Edward Alleyn, Henslowe's still more famous son-in-law. This we learn from the papers at Dulwich, which show us Henslowe advancing sums of money to the impecunious dramatists who worked for the Admiral's men on the security of so many "acts" of the play they happen to be working upon. At Dulwich too are preserved the theatrical plots, all associated with the same company, in some of which act-divisions* can be inferred from the occurrence of dumb-shows and choruses, while in one, *The Dead Man's Fortune*, they are unmistakably marked by lines of crosses, against which in each case is significantly written the word "musique."

Sir Mark Hunter naturally makes the most of this evidence, which

* Such act-divisions do not necessarily imply act-pauses (see below, pp. 392-3).

at first sight looks black for the theory of "unbroken continuity," until we remember that it informs us of the practice of a single company only. It is quite arbitrary to assume, as Sir Mark Hunter seems to do, that what was true of one company was true of all, or that where the Admiral's men led the Chamberlain's men would be likely to follow. Alleyn's company inherited the dramatic tradition of Marlowe, Greene, and Peele, while dramatists like Heywood, Chapman, Day, and Jonson, who worked for it in the 'nineties, were all academic men, deeply imbued with the classical spirit. It was only to be expected that such a company would deal in "acts." The Chamberlain's men, on the other hand, were dependent for dramatic copy, not like Alleyn and Henslowe upon a crowd of impecunious "literary" men whose services they hired, but upon a very unacademic person, an actor, one of themselves, who at any rate during the decade 1594-1604 seems to have supplied them with the bulk of their repertory. Is there any reason to suppose that he was bound to observe the "five-act plan"? Unfortunately we have no extant plots, nothing corresponding with Henslowe's Diary, for Shakespeare's company. But there is one piece of evidence, apart from the Shakespearian texts themselves, which goes a long way to prove that act-pauses were not customary at the Globe Theatre in 1604. *The Malcontent* by Marston was published in that year in two editions representing two versions, one as it was played by the Children of the Queen's Revels at Blackfriars, and the other "with the additions played by the Kings Maiesties servants," *i.e.* by Shakespeare's company. These additions, which comprise two new scenes and about 350 other lines in other parts of the play, in other words new matter equal to about a fifth of *The Tempest* in quantity, are explained in a special Induction as necessary "to entertain a little more time, and to abridge the not-received custom of music in our theatre."* In other words, the Globe playbooks had to be longer than those of the Children at Blackfriars, for the simple reason that while the latter played with act-pauses, occupied with music, like the act-pauses in the modern theatre and at the Rose, such pauses were contrary to the traditions of Shakespeare's playhouse.

The Children of the Queen's Revels, for whom *The Malcontent* was written in its original form, were of course one of those boy-companies which, as Sir Edmund Chambers points out in the passage

* *Elizabethan Stage*, iii. 431.

quoted above, inherited act-pauses as part of their scholastic atmosphere. But in this case, unless I am much mistaken, the practice clung to their playhouse after they had severed their connection with it. They had been the Children of the Chapel under Elizabeth and, as choristers as well as players, they possessed a strong musical bent. Their theatre, the Blackfriars, would come to be associated in the public mind with music, and was probably also structurally adapted for the purpose. There would, therefore, be a strong inducement to any company who succeeded them in its occupation to retain this feature of the playhouse. The significance of all this in the present connexion is that on August 9, 1608, the King's men took possession of the Blackfriars playhouse, and probably began acting there in the autumn of 1609.* Just at this very time Shakespeare himself was loosening his ties with his company. His name is mentioned as one of the new sharers in the Blackfriars, but it is probable that he had nothing but financial relations with that playhouse. In any event, by 1609 he seems to have been living more at Stratford than in London, and according to all the biographers he definitely retired into the country in the year 1611. In other words, when the King's men began using the Blackfriars as their winter playhouse, their greatest dramatist had already done his work; and it is likely that the Shakespearian canon, save perhaps for *The Tempest* and *Henry VIII.*, was complete by that date.

The foregoing facts provide us, I submit, with the real explanation of the difference between the Quartos and the Folio in the matter of act-divisions. All the Quartos except one were published before Shakespeare's company began playing at the Blackfriars, and all the Quartos with that one exception (*Othello*, 1622) are entirely devoid of any trace of act- or scene-divisions. If, on the other hand, we compare the Quarto texts with the corresponding plays as they appeared in the Folio of 1623, we find that in many instances act-divisions have been introduced, and sometimes introduced in the clumsiest manner possible. Take, for instance, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The delightful 1600 Quarto, printed as I believe direct from Shakespeare's manuscript, and indubitably printed from a prompt-copy, is of course without act- or scene-divisions of any kind. And in point of fact it is very difficult to see how any "five-act plan" can be easily applied to this particular play, since from the moment we find ourselves in "the palace wood, a mile without the

* *Elizabethan Stage*, ii. 214.

town" (II.1) until Bottom awakes from his dream at the end of IV.1, the action is dramatically continuous, and on an Elizabethan stage should surely be theatrically continuous also, save perhaps that the traverse before the inner stage might be drawn aside at the beginning of II.2 to reveal the bower of the Fairy Queen, and closed at the end of III.1 to conceal it once again. Yet the Folio inserts its "Actus Tertius" and its "Actus Quartus" into this long scene, and does so at points which in neither case correspond with those at which the traverse might be brought into action. The break at "Actus Tertius," however, is unobjectionable in itself, seeing that it coincides with a theatrical scene-division, for when one group of characters has left the stage to be succeeded by another, the manager can arrange for as long a pause as he thinks fit. The case of "Actus Quartus," on the other hand, presents us with a very different situation. The stage is not clear. The four lovers, at last sorted appropriately, have just been laid asleep by Puck and will not awake until roused by the sound of Theseus' huntsmen (IV.1. 137). On the modern stage there is of course no difficulty. They fall asleep; the curtain is lowered at the end of the traditional Act III.; and the supposed lovers can get up and do anything they like, so long as they are back in their places feigning sleep when the curtain rises again. On an Elizabethan stage this would only have been possible if the sleepers were lying on the inner stage, which was alone provided with a curtain. But the inner stage will not help us here because in the first place there is pretty clear evidence in the stage-arrangements for "Pyramus and Thisby" * that no inner stage was available in the theatre (presumably Blackfriars) on which the Folio setting was given, and in the second place even had an inner stage existed (as no doubt it did for the Quarto version) it would be required for Titania, whose "bower" can hardly be anywhere but at the back of the stage. In any event, it is perfectly clear that the theatrical scribe responsible for the act-divisions in the text was hard put to it at this juncture, and was obliged to leave the lovers asleep on the open stage throughout the act-interval. His instructions, I say, are clear: "They sleepe all the Act," he writes at the end of III.2. Sir Mark Hunter brushes all this aside with a brief reference to "the curious stage-direction in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* . . ., the exact meaning of which I do not attempt to explain." But the meaning is not really in doubt. The word "act" here was explained

* M.N.D. ("New Shakespeare"), 5.1. 350 (note) and pp. 158-159.

long ago by Creizenach as "interval," and he is certainly correct. Cotgrave (1611) glosses *acte* as "an Act or pause in a Comedy or Tragedy"; and the same sense is put upon the word in Marston's *What you will* and Middleton's *Changeling*. An absurd arrangement which would keep the four lovers lying in full view of the audience during the interval for music could hardly have been tolerated, still less provided for, by Shakespeare, and I adhere to my original claim* that this particular stage-direction in the Folio is "an important clue and one eloquent of the shifts which a curtainless stage imposed upon those who attempted to divide the seamless texture of Shakespeare's dramas."

My contention, in short, is that in the Globe Theatre, while Shakespeare worked there, and possibly afterwards also, the custom of act-pauses was as little "received" as was the "custom of music," the two things being bound up together, but that when Shakespeare's company began to use the Blackfriars with its musical traditions they began at the same time to introduce act-pauses into such plays as they performed there. This is of course hypothesis, put forward as an explanation of the facts, not as a justification for the treatment of the Folio divisions in the "New Shakespeare." That justification rests on the facts themselves, facts which, do what he will, Sir Mark Hunter cannot evade, viz. that every Shakespeare text printed during his life, to the number of thirteen Quartos, is devoid of act-divisions, which only appear in texts printed after his death.† Sir Mark Hunter attempts to explain away the absence of act-headings in the Shakespearean Quartos by suggesting either that the act-divisions were noted in the plot and so thought superfluous in the text of the play itself, or that the divisions were "indicated in the MSS. by signs, sufficient for the purposes of the prompt-book, but without meaning for a compositor"; and he claims that these suggestions amount "to something more than plausible conjecture." I am afraid they do not seem to me to possess even the merit of plausibility. For, if the divisions were marked in the plots and not in the acting-copies, how is it they came to be introduced into the acting-copies which were used by the printers of the Folio, introduced, as we have just seen, indubitably for theatrical and not literary reasons? And if, on the

* *Tempest* ("New Shakespeare"), p. xxxvi.

† The fact that the one Quarto, *Othello* 1622, which appeared after Shakespeare's death, aligns itself with the Folio in this respect, indicates that the determining factor was date of publication, and not the difference between Folio and Quarto editions.

other hand, they were indicated, in a fashion however unintelligible to compositors, in the manuscripts the latter used as copy, it is hardly credible that no trace of such indications can have been preserved in thirteen separate publications printed by nine different printers over a period of fifteen years. These thirteen Quartos—Good Quartos, as Dr. Pollard has labelled them—furnish us with the only evidence we possess of the way in which Shakespeare himself would have wished his plays to be performed, for they are printed from manuscripts, often we believe in the author's own hand, which had been used as prompt-books in Shakespeare's own theatre, while he was still there to supervise their performance. An editor who deserts that basis does so at his peril.

I would not be taken for a doctrinaire in this matter. I do not assert that Shakespeare's plays were always acted at the Globe without interruption of any kind. I think it quite likely, for instance, that the company and the audience found a short break convenient in the middle of a long play like *Hamlet*. But such a break had no structural significance; might occur at any point in the play when the stage was left clear; and was a mere matter of theatrical convenience. Moreover, since the Globe was without "music," the break would perforce be brief—the crowds in these public playhouses would be apt to get out of hand with nothing to occupy their attention. Nor, because I believe that Shakespeare took no stock in act-pauses when writing or revising plays, am I to be credited with the absurd notion that he was ignorant that others made use of them. Sometimes, no doubt, as I have suggested, he had to revise the manuscript plays of other men in which act-pauses were marked.* Such indications he would ignore or delete, since the custom of act-pauses was "not received" at the Globe, but their presence may have obliged him to expand the play somewhat, as in the case of Marston's *Malcontent*, in order "to entertain a little more time." *Henry V.* was, I suspect, a play of this kind.† Almost certainly based upon a pre-Shakespearian drama, of which traces are still evident in the bad Quarto of 1600, the received text shows by its five choruses to which Sir Mark Hunter triumphantly points, that the original had

* *Tempest* ("New Shakespeare"), p. xxxvi, where I wrote, with more confidence than I now feel, that the presence of act-divisions in Shakespeare's early plays "may be taken as evidence that he was revising other men's work and omitted to delete the act-headings." It is just as likely that they were introduced at some Blackfriars revival in the second decade of the seventeenth century.

† *Romeo and Juliet*, another revised play, may have been a second instance.

been constructed on the five-act plan. But those choruses most certainly do not prove that the play was acted at the Globe in 1599 with act-pauses. On the contrary, they were, as I believe, simply part of that additional matter which, like the Induction and "additions" in the Globe version of the *Malcontent*, had to be supplied to fill up the pauses in the original and give the audience their accustomed uninterrupted afternoon's entertainment.

Again, if Shakespeare knew all about this act-business, why should he not refer to it in the dialogue of his plays? Sir Mark Hunter cites eleven passages from indisputable Shakespearian plays which contain "allusions to acts, as regular features of a stage-play," and seems to think them "damaging to the theory of the seamless texture." Allusions of this kind have not necessarily any bearing whatever upon Shakespeare's practice, more especially as most of them are quibbles, which, as Johnson says, "gave him such delight that he was content to purchase it by the sacrifice of reason, propriety, and truth." That Shakespeare, therefore, should refer to "acts" as a part of a play would not be in the least surprising. What did surprise me, however, when I came to look up Sir Mark Hunter's references, was to find that in not a single passage does Shakespeare show any consciousness that an "act" comprised more than one scene, and was indeed the fifth part of a play. On the contrary, he generally uses "act" and "scene" as if they were synonymous terms, and where they are not "act" seems to signify something briefer still—a mere episode.

The only passage in the collection which refers to an actual performance upon the stage makes this clear enough. Says Hamlet to Horatio :

There is a play to-night before the king ;
One scene in it comes near the circumstance
Which I have told you of my father's death :
I prithee, when thou seest *that act afoot*
Even with the very comment of thy soul
Observe mine uncle.

The "act" to which Hamlet refers is, of course, the action or episode of the murder of Gonzago by Lucianus. If Sir Mark Hunter is able to derive any satisfaction from the citation of such a passage in support of his "five-act-plan" theory, he is welcome to it.

IV

There remains the question whether Shakespeare, apart from theatrical practice, actually constructed his plays according to what

may be called a five-act rhythm. To use Sir Mark Hunter's words : " Have these outer lines of division any vital relation to the inner movement in a play's evolution, or may they, without injury to the essential structure, be shifted or obliterated ? " It will be obvious from what has been said above concerning *A Midsummer Night's Dream* that I do not believe that Shakespeare had any such five-act rhythm in mind when creating his plays, and in this, as Sir Mark Hunter admits, I have a powerful ally in Mr. Granville-Barker. But I shall argue no more upon the matter. I prefer to appeal to Cæsar, or rather to that wisest and best of all Shakespearian editors, Dr. Johnson.

I have preserved [he wrote in his preface of 1765] the common distribution into acts, though I believe it to be in almost all the plays void of authority. Some of those which are divided in the later editions have no division in the first folio, and some that are divided in the folio have no division in the preceding copies. The settled mode of the theatre requires four intervals in the play, but few, if any, of our author's compositions can be properly distributed in that manner. An act is so much of the drama as passes without intervention of time or change of place. A pause makes a new act. In every real, and therefore in every imitative action, the intervals may be more or fewer, the restriction of five acts being accidental and arbitrary. This Shakespeare knew, and this he practised ; his plays were written and at first printed in one unbroken continuity, and ought now to be exhibited with short pauses, interposed as often as the scene is changed, or any considerable time is required to pass. This method would at once quell a thousand absurdities.

The practice of the " New Shakespeare," which Sir Mark Hunter attacks, is nothing new or revolutionary ; it is merely an application of Dr. Johnson's precepts.

JOHN MARSTON, DRAMATIST

AT OXFORD, 1591 (?)–1594, 1609

BY ROBERT E. BRETTLE

THE bare dates have long been known of the Oxford career of the Brasenose College John Marston, who is very reasonably taken to be the dramatist. Recently it has been inferred that he was back in Oxford in December 1609, when he was ordained priest from St. Mary Hall and supplicated in the Congregation of the University for permission to use the Bodleian Library.*

Reference to the original records of the University checks information already used, for instance, by Anthony à Wood, and raises various questions.† It suggests that Marston was matriculated after he had been in residence at Brasenose College for three terms, or that one of his statements in his degree "supplicat" was false; that his social status was not accurately described in the Matriculation Register; and that after taking his B.A. degree by "determination" he spent three years and more in philosophy.

A student's admission to his college or hall generally took place a week or two before his formal entrance to the University, which consisted of two ceremonies, Subscription and Matriculation. At Subscription the student had to declare on the usual oath on the Gospels his assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Royal Supremacy, and to sign his name on one of the manuscript pages bound with a printed copy of the Thirty-nine Articles. At Matriculation, immediately following Subscription, the Vice-Chancellor formally admitted the student and gave him a certificate of admission. Record of matriculation was kept: the

* *Modern Language Review*, vol. 22, pp. 11–13.

† For access to the registers and permission to use information from them I am greatly indebted to Dr. Poole, late Keeper of the University Archives. The fullest account of the system of education at Oxford during the period 1560–1620 is given by Clark in his *Register*, vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 1–66; I use information almost entirely from him.

student told to one of the university bedells his age, the quality or condition of his father, the county of his birth, and this information, with christian and surname and generally the date, was entered in the Matriculation Register. It should be noted that matriculation fees varied according to the condition of the father: a knight's son (*filius equitis aurati*) paid more than the eldest son of an esquire (*armigeri filius natu maximus*), who in turn paid more than a gentleman's son (*generosi filius*).

But the early Matriculation Registers of the University are not entirely accurate, neither were they completely kept.* Moreover, matriculation was frequently postponed, so that the matriculation date is often not the date of a student's first entry into the University. A student under sixteen years of age might be matriculated but was not required to subscribe, and in some cases matriculation was probably deferred until he was of an age to subscribe. I think that some such postponement happened with Marston, and that he first began residence in Brasenose College in Trinity Term 1591, but did not subscribe and matriculate until February 1591-2. This, indeed, is the only alternative to believing that Marston in his degree "supplicat" was guilty of making false statements—a thing in itself not improbable in those times. Marston did not begin his sixteenth year until October 1591, and could only call himself sixteen years of age in October 1592.†

But to deal with the actual records. With Marston there is no discrepancy between the order of entries in the Subscription Book and the dated entries in the Matriculation Register. His boyish signature, undoubtedly genuine, is to be found, and fixes the spelling of his name.

"Johannes Marston." ‡

The entry concerning him in the Matriculation Register is as follows :

"Joh : marston War^r gen : fil æt s—16." §

Marston was in his sixteenth year, and he may have been born in

* Clark, *Register*, vol. 2, pt. 1, introd. p. 18, gives a reconstructed account of the mode of entry which led to oversights.

† According to the date of christening, October 7, 1576, recently found.

‡ Univ. Oxon. Arch. Subscription Book A.b. 1, leaf 75 verso, two-thirds down column one. I have a photograph of it and contiguous entries.

§ The Brasenose admissions begin on p. 305 of Matriculation Register P. The Marston entry is on p. 321, the eighth out of nine matriculated on Friday, February 4, 1591 (1592 according to the modern reckoning of the beginning of the year).

Warwickshire, at Coventry, although most probably he was christened at Wardington, Oxfordshire. It is to be noted that his matriculation fee was that required from a gentleman's son, which was the least if it was not the most that Marston could say or allow to be said of his social standing.

He next appears in University records in connection with his taking the degree of Bachelor of Arts. On his own evidence he passed through the various exercises for that degree. In or after the ninth term came the disputations "in Parvisis," when the student was expected to reply in grammatical and logical subjects. The disputants were either "scholares" who had already gone through the disputations and so were doing it "pro termino," or "scholares" doing it for the first time as an exercise for the degree ("pro forma"). Three disputed at a time, a respondent and two opponents. The student "pro forma," as Marston must have been once, was required (a) "semel opponere," (b) "semel ab hora prima ad horam tertiam respondere." The Presidents or Supervisors were the Regent Masters or their deputies. These disputations took place every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of term, and at the end of each day the "pro forma" disputants were created by the "moderator" "sophistæ generales," or, briefly, "generales"—a quasi-degree in logic and grammar. According to his own statement Marston was "semel generalis creatus."

The second set of exercises for the B.A. degree was the disputations during Lent. "Scholares" after four terms "in dialectica" were allowed to present themselves, and had to be twice respondents to the "determining bachelors" (i.e. those who had already passed through their Lent disputations) in the subjects in which they, the "determining bachelors," were disputing for the completion of their B.A. degree ("bis respondere sub Baccalaureo in quadragesima"). One "scholaris" responded to one bachelor at a time, and the statutable length of such "responsion" was one and a half hours. Marston passed through these Lent "responsions."

The formalities in taking the B.A. degree were five or sixfold, and as records are available for three there is no reason to suppose that Marston did not go through all of them.

First, the "supplicat." The student had "supplicare gratiam" of the University to take a degree, which was conferred in Congregation, the house of Regents, i.e. M.A.'s of the first and second years from their inception, and Doctors in Law, Medicine, and Theology

of the same standing. The procedure in obtaining leave was not simple. The student, with the consent of his college, prepared a "supplicat" setting forth that he had completed or had been dispensed from exercises and residence, and asking leave to lecture in a book of Aristotle's logic—the phrase for asking B.A. The paper was given to the regent-master of the student's own college to submit to Congregation on four occasions. The proctors took the whispered voting. If there was no opposition, "*gratia concessa est*" and the candidate might prepare for presentation to the degree. An entry of the granting of the grace was made in the register of Congregation and was generally a copy of the "supplicat," with a note of the granting and conditions thereof (as "*simpliciter*" or "*modo determinet proxima quadragesima*"), and the date. Marston's "supplicat," with the note of granting, dated February 5, 1593-4, is as follows:

*Supplicat venerabili Congregationi magistrorum Regentium Johannes Merston/Armigeri filius natu maximus scholaris facultatis artium ex collegio Aenei nasi./quatenus vndecim terminos posuerit in studio Dialectices pro Duo decimo/in venerabili Domo Convocationis Dispensatum fuerit semel generalis creatus fuerit/bis subbachalaureo in quadragesima responderit et reliqua perfecerit que/per nova statuta requiruntur vt hec ei sufficiant quo admittatur ad Lectionem cuiuscunque libri Logices : gratia conceditur modo Determinet proxima quadragesima.**

Quite a few points are raised by this supplication. The spelling variation need hardly trouble us, as later records of Marston graduating from Brasenose College revert to the old spelling; neither need the description "eldest son of an esquire." Clark pointed out the money motive of matriculants describing themselves or allowing themselves to be described as of a lower order socially than they really were. Such half-truths were quite common. Moreover, there was a reason for the change. The ordinary period of residence for a B.A. degree, as defined by the "new" statutes, now lost but of c. 1560, was four years or sixteen terms. But sons of peers (including the lords spiritual), sons of "*equites aurati*," and (after a decree of January 26, 1590-1) the eldest sons of esquires, were allowed to claim and generally did claim one year's exemption. Marston was quite entitled to describe himself as the eldest son of an esquire, and so to take his B.A. degree after three years' residence.

* Register L or 10, leaf 185 *recto*. Italicised letters indicate expansions of handwriting abbreviations.

But if his matriculation date is taken to be the date of his first entry into the University, he cannot have completed his stated residence; he can only have been in residence nine terms. Either his statement in the "supplicat" is false, or Marston was matriculated during his third term of residence. There would be nothing inherently strange in a false statement; according to Clark they were fairly frequent.* On the other hand, it is possible that Marston came into residence at Brasenose College in Trinity Term 1591, at the age of fourteen and a half, and did not matriculate until after three terms, when he was more of an age to subscribe.

The "supplicat" speaks of a dispensation in Convocation from one term's residence. Dispensations were granted to individuals or to groups of students. There is no special individual dispensation for Marston; but a general dispensation for a group of students to omit one term's residence is to be found in the register of Convocation among the records of a meeting held on January 29, 1593-4. The supplication of the "scholares determinaturi hac quadragesima" and the note of granting are as follows:

Supplicant venerabili Convocationi Doctorum Magistrorum Regentium, et non/Regentium Scholares hac quadragesima Determinaturi vt gratiose secum Dispensetur/pro defectu vnus termini, et vt Liceat ijs non obstante aliquo statuto/vniuersitatis de terminis perimplendis gratias suas proponere in Domo Congregationis/Causa est quod alias eorum nonnulli alijs impedimento futuri sint eiusdem ordinis/qui abhinc Diu terminos compleverunt hec Dispensatio concessa est simpliciter.†

One of the great difficulties in Lent was the paucity of the numbers of "determining" bachelors to whom the "scholares" might respond. "Determination" was often shirked.

To return to the other four or five formalities in taking the degree. After the student had successfully supplicated for the grace of Congregation, he went through the ceremony of *Circuitus* or *Visitatio*, of asking the Vice-Chancellor and the proctors to summon a Congregation in which he might be admitted to his degree.

* By a decree of Convocation, July 4, 1575, no one was to propose a grace in Congregation or convocation unless he had sworn that it was true; and the reason given for the decree was that Congregation almost daily, and Convocation sometimes, was deceived by graces being asked which contained false statements (see Clark, *Register*, vol. 2, pt. 1, introd. p. 28).

† Register L or 10, leaf 263 verso. The endings of "Dispensetur" and "Congregationis" are hardly to be read because of the amount of the inner margin taken up by the binder.

On the day in which the candidate was to be admitted, nine B.A.'s who had already "determined" had to come to St. Mary's before the time of congregation and "depone" for the candidate in the Apodyterium or outer room of the Congregation house. This *Depositio* was a declaration on oath of their real sentiments whether the student was "aptus et idoneus moribus et scientia."

The candidates were marched from their respective colleges to the Apodyterium and there signed the Thirty-nine Articles and took the oath of assent to the Royal Supremacy.* After subscription each candidate was brought in separately to the Congregation House and presented by the regent-master of his college to the Vice-Chancellor (and the proctors), who admitted him to his degree with the formula about lecturing on a book of Aristotle's logic. When this ceremony was over, an entry of the persons so admitted was made in the register of Congregation in the list for the year headed "Admissi ad lectionem alicujus libri facultatis artium" (or variants). In the list for the academic year 1593-4, Marston's name appears fourth out of fourteen admitted on February 6. The first five names and the last one are from Brasenose College. The entry is:

"John Marston." †

As soon as the candidate had been admitted to the degree, he was by courtesy styled "Bachelor of Arts," but his degree was not really completed until he had taken part in disputations, known as "determination," which lasted throughout the whole season of Lent. As a rule the University insisted—as with Marston—that the student should "determine" in the Lent immediately following his presentation ("proxima quadragesima").

On the Saturday before Ash Wednesday (*Festum Ovorum*, or Egg Saturday) all students who intended to "determine" that Lent presented themselves at St. Mary's, where the ceremony of "deponing" had to be gone through again: each junior bachelor (*i.e.* about to "determine") had to get nine senior bachelors (*i.e.* who had already "determined") to "depone" for him. The names and generally the colleges of those admitted to "determine" were taken by the registrar and entered in the register of Congregation in a list headed "Nomina determinantium" (or variants). In such a list, dated the Saturday before Lent 1593-4 (*i.e.* February 9),

* The first book of these subscriptions does not begin until 1670.

† Register L or 10, leaf 174 verso, column 2, fourth name.

Marston's name occurs ninth on a list of ten from Brasenose College :

"Johannes Marston." *

There is every reason for believing that Marston took his share with other "determining" bachelors in the subsequent proceedings. "Determination" was entirely under the control of the Junior Proctor, who on the Saturday before Palm Sunday (here March 23) made a speech administering praise and blame. This concluded "determination," and B.A.'s were free to proceed by residence and exercises to the M.A. degree.

Marston is not known to have proceeded M.A., and records of him are not again to be found in the University Archives until after fifteen years.

From the register of the Bishop of Oxford it is found that a John Marston, described as a Bachelor of Arts of Brasenose College in the University of Oxford, was ordained deacon on September 24, 1609.† This is almost certainly the same Marston whose university records ending on February 9, 1593-4, have been given above. Three months later in 1609, on December 24, a John Marston, described as a Bachelor of Arts from St. Mary Hall, was ordained priest. There can be little doubt now, to judge from ordinary clerical procedure and the evidence of handwriting, that the Marston ordained priest in December was the same as the one ordained deacon in September. The inference is that Marston came up to Oxford in 1609 and entered this time at St. Mary Hall, before December 24 and most probably at the beginning of that Michaelmas Term. He is known to have been a "clerk" or priest at Barford St. Martin in Wiltshire by June 18, 1610, and the probability is that he was only at St. Mary Hall for one year or for two or three terms.‡

On December 7, 1609, Marston supplicated successfully in the Congregation of the University for permission to use the Bodleian Library. The copy of his "supplicat" and the note of granting are as follows :

Supplicat etc (*i.e.* venerabili Congregationi) Johannes Marston bachel-laureus facultatis artium ex aula Sanctæ Mariæ, vt quatenus tres annos et

* Register L or 10, leaf 189 recto. The Brasenose College list is at the head of column 2.

† See *Modern Language Review*, vol. 22, pp. 11-13, where references are given.

‡ Trinity (law) Term 1610 was from June 8 to June 28.

vitra a suscepto bacchalaureatus gradus in studio philosophiæ posuerit
liceat ei bona vestra cum venia publicæ bibliothecæ beneficio frui:
conceditur simpliciter.*

But Marston, in addition to securing a "grace" of Congregation, took the oath of fidelity to the library. It so happens that lists of graduates and others admitted to read in the Bodleian are still preserved. They begin late in 1609, and were made by the librarian or university notary until c. 1616, when autograph signatures and dates begin to appear. On leaf 145 recto of this first Bodleian Admission Book begin the lists of "Graduati ex Aula S. Mariæ." The eighteenth out of the thirty-one names in column one is:

"M^r. Marson." †

The only statement in the "supplicat" that calls for comment is that Marston, since taking his B.A. degree, had spent three years and more in philosophy. The statement may be a vainglorious brag or, most probably, just a general statement of fact referring to Marston's studies since 1594. It could hardly refer to a special stay in Oxford of more than three years, sometime between 1594 and 1609, even though the thought is tempting that Marston, after forfeiting his share of a chamber in the Middle Temple in 1606, returned to Brasenose for philosophical studies until, in 1609, he decided to enter the Church, when he transferred to St. Mary Hall. The title-page of the second edition of *The Fawn*, 1606, tells of his absence from London; and he himself in his address to that play speaks comfortingly of "his bosom friend, good Epictetus." His Latin verses and descriptions for the 1606 pageant might argue his presence in London in July of that year. His Entertainment at Ashby in 1607 need not have taken him out of Oxford except in vacations; and his imprisonment in June 1608 was probably not long enough to absorb all his Long Vacation. But perhaps on the whole, and especially if it is remembered that Marston was most probably married before 1608, the statement of three years and more in the study of philosophy can best be understood as a general statement making no reference to any specific period of time between 1594 and 1609.

* The third of three "graces," "beneficio Bibliothecæ frui," granted on December 7. Register K reversed or 12, leaf 60 verso.

† MS. Bodl. 766. The first dated entry of column one on leaf 145 recto is the twenty-seventh—December 10, 1612.

THE STORY CONTAINED IN THE SECOND SERIES OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

By J. A. FORT

THE original edition of Shakespeare's Sonnets, which was published by Thomas Thorpe in 1609, contained first of all 126 short poems, all of which, as most editors hold, were addressed to a Fair Youth, twenty-six short poems, most of which were either addressed to or in some way connected with a Dark Lady, then two Sonnets which do not seem to be connected with either of the earlier series, and finally a poem which contained 329 lines and was entitled "A Lover's Complaint." Elsewhere, I have suggested that if the first of these four collections of poems is connected with Shakespeare's friendly patron, Lord Southampton, and all the letters written to him are read in the order in which Thorpe printed them, a consistent and probable narrative emerges from them; and, seeing how scanty and cautious most published commentaries on the "Dark Lady" Sonnets and "A Lover's Complaint" are, it seems worth while to examine the later poems in Thorpe's book too, in a somewhat similar manner. Though all of these are minor works in comparison with the Fair Youth Sonnets, yet each of them presents some points of interest, and on a dark night even a little lamp may help a traveller very greatly.

A few words are sufficient commentary on the last two Sonnets in Thorpe's book; the bath referred to in No. 153, v. 7, and in No. 154, v. 11, was clearly in the city of Bath; the poems are of such a kind that they may have been handed by any gentleman to any lady who was going to stay at Bath; and they were composed on a theme which was old in epigrammatic literature, though the source from which Shakespeare directly drew his idea has not been identified. As for "A Lover's Complaint," in which a woman tells an elderly man how she has been wooed and betrayed by a handsome youth, a suggestion made by the Comtesse de Chambrun seems to me

correct, and I believe that the poem was written as a plea on behalf of Southampton's mistress, Lady Elizabeth Vernon, when Southampton seemed likely to abandon her. The elderly man of the poem is Shakespeare described in such a way that Shakespeare could disown the identification; the woman is depicted as Lady Elizabeth Vernon would look a few years later if Southampton abandoned her; while in point after point the long description of the betrayer in stanzas 12 to 21 recalls the Fair Youth of the first series of Sonnets. The poem was written in such a style that it could be handed to Southampton as a literary exercise only, but Shakespeare's hand must have held the pen, I think, when the last six stanzas of it were set down on paper. This theory not only changes a feeble composition into an almost forcible one, but explains the inclusion of these verses in Thorpe's volume, while no other theory with which I am acquainted throws any light at all either upon their purpose or their origin. If this view is correct, it is a reasonable conjecture that the poem dates from the spring of 1597, when Southampton's liaison with Lady Elizabeth had continued for more than a year, and when he was about to join in a naval expedition against Spain.

The problems, however, which arise in connection with the Dark Lady Sonnets are far more complicated. In the first place, though I once suggested in print a very different view, it seems to me certain now, from a more detailed examination of these poems, that most of them must be connected, as they are usually connected, with the episode of the "Stolen Mistress" referred to in Nos. 33 to 42 of the Southampton Sonnets; in the second place, it also seems clear that some of these poems cannot ever have been sent to the Dark Lady herself; and yet, thirdly, since Thorpe kept all the Southampton Sonnets together and then printed the two Lady of Bath Sonnets together as well as "The Lover's Complaint" by itself, it seems to me probable that he regarded Nos. 127 to 152 as forming in some sense one collection of poems. Hardly any editor has seriously considered these points, and yet, if we are ever to read in these poems all that the author wrote in them, it is quite necessary that we should have some sort of a theory as to the person, or at least the kind of person, to whom they were addressed, and of the circumstances under which they were composed.

Though Shakespeare's language is often obscure, yet, if words mean anything at all, the essential facts of the drama which formed the subject-matter of these poems are beyond dispute; though the

Dark Lady was not generally considered beautiful (see especially Nos. 131 and 148), was another man's wife (No. 152, v. 3), and had had other lovers besides the poet (see especially No. 137, v. 6, and No. 142, v. 8), she was, when Shakespeare wrote No. 127, his mistress in the fullest sense of the word (see especially Nos. 151 and 152), and he was genuinely attached to her (No. 42, v. 2). Soon after Shakespeare wrote the 127th Sonnet, however, she began to break off her connection with the poet and either won, or seemed to win, the favour of his friend; in the end she "jilted" Shakespeare, and she probably at one time became Southampton's mistress, but Shakespeare himself was not quite certain on this last point even when he wrote No. 144. The reader will be less inclined to blame the Earl for his treatment of the poet if he will look into the details of the story which the latter tells, for the Dark Lady was not a mistress living in Shakespeare's house, and the right of an adulterer to a particular woman is not, after all, exactly a right; and he will be less inclined to blame Shakespeare too, if he will consider the nature of the choice which was set before him. In this connection the question of time is of prime importance, and if the time-scheme, which I suggested for the Southampton Sonnets in a previous article, is at all correct, it was soon after the 26th Sonnet was written, *i.e.* it was in May or June 1594, that Southampton first began to court the Dark Lady. In the spring of 1594, however, Shakespeare was very deeply indebted to his patron, without whose help he could hardly have printed his first two published works, and from whom he had almost certainly received pecuniary assistance, while his future career, too, seemed to depend on the Earl to a large extent: the poet's own statement on the subject is still to be read in the Dedication to "Lucrece." Moreover, at this very time Shakespeare was again in the middle of one of the crises in his fortunes, for, owing to the fact that all the London theatres had been closed through nearly the whole of the year 1593 and the first five months of 1594, all the companies of Players found it difficult to earn their expenses in those years; Shakespeare himself was a writer rather than an actor in that period, and if, as Mr. J. Tucker Murray holds, he was already a member of the Strange-Chamberlain Company in the spring of 1594, that company lost its patron by death in April of that year, and could not find a suitable theatre in which to act before at the earliest the following autumn. Meanwhile, what sort of a person was the Dark Lady? Though at one time it seemed to me

impossible, it now seems to me established that there once really was a woman who was ready to become an actor's mistress and for whom Shakespeare yet composed most of the elaborate poems which form the Second Series of his Sonnets. On the whole I think that Professor Fischer's suggestion on this subject is right, and that socially she was in much the same position as Mistress Ford, or Mistress Page of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*; she could play on the virginal, and she must frequently have attended the theatres or she would hardly have understood the poet's polished verses; she was unfaithful to Shakespeare when he was very far from being unfaithful to her; I doubt whether much more than this will ever be known about her.

While Shakespeare was writing the Dark Lady Sonnets (Nos. 127 to 152 in Thorpe's book) his love-affair passed, if we accept Thorpe's narrative as it stands, through three stages, namely, one in which he was the favoured lover of the Dark Lady, one in which the Dark Lady gradually transferred her affection or her favour to his patron, and one in which she had definitely broken off her connection with the poet; the whole episode did not, I think, occupy a longer period of time than two or at the outside three months, and I find a more intelligible tale if I read these sonnets in their original order than if I read them in the order in which either Mr. Butler or Professor Fischer or Sir Denys Bray has re-arranged them. Sonnets Nos. 127 to 132, with the exception of No. 129 with which I will deal later, represent, I believe, the first stage in this love-affair, while Nos. 133 and 134, which were sent under one cover, as well as Nos. 33 and 34 of the Southampton Sonnets, also sent probably under one cover, represent the beginning of the second stage in it; from this point the interpretation of the poems becomes less simple, but the following seems to me a reasonable explanation of them: though Shakespeare had professedly resigned his mistress to his patron, yet he continued to visit her for some time longer, since clearly he had seen her shortly before he wrote No. 139 and No. 140 and No. 145, and he tried hard for a while to detach her from Southampton; this stage in the drama is, I hold, represented by Nos. 135 to 145 of the Dark Lady Sonnets, and by Nos. 36 to 39 (for I include even Nos. 38 and 39) of the Southampton Sonnets. No. 146 I regard as a special sonnet, with which I will deal shortly, and the rest of the series as representing the last stage in the intrigue, that is, I consider Nos. 147 to 152 to be the letters in which he

definitely broke with his mistress (I doubt if he passed beyond her outer door when he delivered these at her house), and Nos. 40 to 42 to be the letters in which he finally resigned her to his patron. The Fair Youth and the Dark Lady poems dovetail in with each other if they are read in this way, and I see no serious difficulties in the way of thus harmonising them except in some special cases which I will discuss in my next paragraph; that Shakespeare should have interspersed the affectionate poems Nos. 38 and 39 among poems of remonstrance, and the trivial poems Nos. 135, 136, and 145 among poems of fierce indignation, is, I think, intelligible though it at first surprises us. He must have had hopes as well as fears during these anxious weeks; it was quite natural that he should use as weapons in this contest raillery and cajolery as well as anger; he had only his affection and his wit to oppose to the wealth and charm of his distinguished rival.

It is advisable that I should add some more detailed comments to this general statement of my views, and I will begin by discussing four sonnets, which stand in several respects in a class by themselves, and which have a very special importance, since any theory as to the nature and purpose of the Dark Lady Sonnets must ultimately depend on the theory that is adopted as to the nature and purpose of these four poems. Two of them, Nos. 129 and 146, are noble poems on general topics, while, though the other two, Nos. 138 and 144, refer to Shakespeare's troubles at this time, the author seems in them to be regarding those troubles objectively only. Moreover, in form these four sonnets are unlike the other twenty-two of the series, since they are soliloquies, while the rest are letters, and when the text of each of them is examined it seems most unlikely that any of them can have been written to be sent to Shakespeare's mistress: No. 129 is a disquisition upon Lust, and No. 146 on Extravagant Living, while No. 138 cannot have been composed as an appeal to the Dark Lady, and the implication in the last line of No. 144 is so brutal that even an Elizabethan could hardly have shown that poem to a lady. So there are, I submit, four poems in the Dark Lady Series which were never sent to that personage, and I have to explain, if I can, both the nature of these Sonnets and how they came to stand where they do stand in Thorpe's text. The theory that the Second Series of poems in Thorpe's book is simply a collection of more or less independent compositions disregards the fact that twenty-two out of the twenty-six poems in the series are

evidently addressed to the same individual, while my theory that Thorpe regarded Nos. 127 to 152 as forming a single collection of poems obliges me to believe that he found the four Sonnets, which I am discussing, placed where he placed them among the others of which he obtained possession ; and, since I cannot myself accept the view that Shakespeare wrote many of his Sonnets for his own perusal only, I have to fall back on a very bold conjecture indeed. In my own mind I class Nos. 129 and 146 with the fine Sonnets on general subjects which appear sporadically among the Southampton Sonnets ; Nos. 55, 60, 64, 65, 66, and 116 are some of them, and Shakespeare's own explanation of them is to be found, I hold, in No. 100, v. 7, which means, as I interpret it, that when some fine subject seized hold upon him, he versified it, and sent his verses to the friend who appreciated his poetry most ; since I can find no parallels to Nos. 129 and 146 except in the first series of Sonnets, I believe that Shakespeare wrote them partly because he had found a fine subject, partly to dissuade Southampton from his amorous pursuits and his lavish expenditure, but that then he did not venture to hand them to his patron, and laid them aside with the other poems which he was writing at this time. As for Nos. 138 and 144, I believe that they had a very similar origin—that is, I believe that Shakespeare could not help versifying a good dramatic situation, but that he did not at that time send his verses to either of his correspondents. It is strange that the only two poems which Jaggard in 1598 printed in the *Passionate Pilgrim* were two of the only four sonnets among all those that Shakespeare had written by that time, over which he had, if my view is correct, an absolute right of disposal. No doubt my theory is a bold one, but any commentary on the Dark Lady which does not include a definite theory about these four mysterious poems, is no better than a marble figure which has lost its head. I turn back next to the earliest sonnets of this series ; No. 127 is simply a paraphrase of *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv. iii. 250 to 265 ; and the first line of No. 128 echoes the first line of No. 8—so Southampton was not seeing the Dark Lady Sonnets at this time ; No. 130 is a strange poem to write to a lady, but I class it myself in one respect with Nos. 135, 136, and 145, that is, I believe that it represents the kind of jesting which the Dark Lady herself appreciated most ; No. 131 and the fine No. 132 I regard as genuine love-poems. The next group of Sonnets, on which the reader will expect some comment, is that of the "Will-Sonnets," Nos. 135,

136, and 143; but since most of the riddles contained in them have been guessed already, and I have already given my theory as to the purpose of their quibbling in connection with No. 130, I propose to deal fully with one passage only in them, namely, the first two lines of No. 135, which seem at first definitely to confute the theory that the rival lover of the Dark Lady was Lord Southampton. The accepted view that, when Thorpe printed *Will* with a capital letter and in italics in these three sonnets, he meant to show that the word denoted a man's name, seems to me correct if I may substitute "a man" for "a man's name," while the view that Shakespeare was here speaking of the lady's husband, whose name was presumably William, of himself, and of his rival seems to me certainly correct, and yet I hold that it does not necessarily follow that his rival's name was William. The key to the interpretation of this passage is, I am convinced, to be found in No. 143, v. 7, where the phrase "have thy *Will*" occurs again, and where it undoubtedly refers to Shakespeare's rival; I suggest, however, that the phrase means there not "William" but "what you want" or "what you are pursuing," for that interpretation fits the simile contained in No. 143 far better than any reference to a name William: the first two lines of No. 135 seem to me, therefore, almost certainly to mean "you have won what you want, namely, my friend, you have your husband in your power or attached to you, and you have me in the same case." I believe that the author, who may or may not have indicated the italics of Thorpe's text, used a capital letter in this passage to denote a man rather than a man's name, while No. 135, v. 1, contains a true antithesis instead of a false one, if this explanation is accepted. If this view of the passage is rejected, I still hold to my point, only arguing instead that Southampton had been introduced to the Dark Lady under a pseudonym which concealed his true position and title. I wish next to press a point, to which I attach considerable importance but which generally escapes notice, in connection with two more sonnets, Nos. 137 and 152: there is no obscurity in the text of either of them, but again and again I ask myself, "How did they ever reach Thorpe's hands?" Both, no doubt, were sent originally to the Dark Lady, but how can any woman who ever lived possibly have handed over either of those sonnets for publication? There is yet one minor point which I cannot help noticing in connection with three poems, Nos. 139, 143 (again), and the trivial No. 145; the beautiful poetry of so many of these sonnets makes us conceive

the incidents referred to in them as being romantic or at least remarkable ones, and yet that cannot by any means have been always the case ; No. 143 seems just founded on an incident that Shakespeare had noticed in one of his walks, No. 145 was definitely occasioned by a chance remark of the Dark Lady, while the splendid opening of No. 139 can only mean that that personage had once pleaded, " You asked me yourself to make myself agreeable to your friend." Such, then, is my interpretation of certain passages in these poems which at first perplexed me, but at any rate the general course of Shakespeare's love-affair can be traced clearly enough in Thorpe's volume—there are no anxious or angry poems in the Dark Lady Series till we reach No. 133 ; then in the group Nos. 135 to 145 there are, apart from the fiery No. 137, friendly letters only, in five of which, Nos. 135, 136, 141, 143, and 145, Shakespeare begs his mistress to return to him ; while from No. 147 every sonnet seems to have been written for the express purpose of wounding and offending the poet's correspondent.

Thus the tale that I find in the Dark Lady Sonnets is one which has often been told before, but in the case of an old literary work, as in that of an old picture, a crust often gathers on it in the course of time, and till that crust is cleared away we cannot see all the details that are there distinctly, or properly examine the composition as a whole. So, as I read and re-read these poems, three points, which at first I had seen most indistinctly, gradually forced themselves upon my notice more and more, till they seemed to me at last of considerable importance : firstly, if the same incidents are referred to in two contemporary series of letters, those incidents must necessarily be real and not imaginary ones ; secondly, if the narrative contained in the Dark Lady Sonnets is not only a consistent narrative in itself, but harmonises also with a narrative found in the Fair Youth Sonnets, Thorpe's order for the poems in both series must be considered to be at least approximately correct ; finally, though ethically the story which Shakespeare tells us about this involved love-affair is a very sorry one, yet, as I have said before, Southampton only stole what was already stolen and Shakespeare only resigned a mistress who had already abandoned him.

So much, then, for the actual narrative which is contained in the Dark Lady Sonnets, but there is one further point of extreme interest which emerges from a study of them, for if the views which I have expressed about Nos. 129 and 146, 138 and 144, 137 and 152 are

correct, two very awkward questions necessarily suggest themselves, namely, "Who first formed these 26 sonnets into a single collection of poems?" and "Who finally handed that collection to Thorpe's agent?" Shakespeare himself, so far as I can see, is the only person who ever held in his hands all the poems of the second series before 1609; but that is both an unwelcome thought and a disputable proposition; there is not sufficient evidence as yet to justify any definite view upon this difficult subject.

AN UNDESCRIBED MS. OF DONNE'S POEMS

BY H. J. L. ROBBIE

THE study of MSS. containing the poems of John Donne has a certain importance because the poet himself printed no edition of his work. Professor Grierson, the editor of the Clarendon Press edition, gives a list of almost forty MSS. which he used in that great work. The collation of MSS. of whose existence he was then unaware is not likely to make the slightest difference in the readings of his text, but such work may show the existence of MSS. which have a closer resemblance to the copy used by the printer of the 1633 edition * than any known to Donne's modern editors.

One such MS. is now, through the generosity and kindly offices of Dr. Geoffrey Keynes, in the University Library, Cambridge (Additional 5778). Of its 133 folios, ff. 2-77b are a MS. collection of John Donne's poems; the remaining folios contain sundry seventeenth-century medicinal and theological observations, and inaccurate texts of a few popular seventeenth-century poems.

The contents of the MS. are as follows :

INFINITATI SACRUM 16°. AUGUSTI 1601 METEM-
PSYCHOSIS POEMA SATYRICON.

EPISTLE. Others at the porches, etc. . . .

First Songe. I singe the Progresse of a Deathlesse Soule (1633, pp. 1-27).

Holy Sonnetts. *La Corona* (1633, pp. 28-32).

Sonnetts. *Holy*, 1-12 (1633, pp. 32-40).

Satyres 1st-5th. (1633, pp. 325-49).

Elegie 1st. Not y^e in Couller yt was lyke thy hayre.

Elegie 2nd. Come, Madame, Come, All Rest my powers defye.

Elegie 3rd. Fond Woaman w^{ch} wouldst have thy husband dye (1633, pp. 44-5).

Elegie 4th. Marry and love thy Flavea, for shee (1633, pp. 45-7).

* Hereafter referred to as 1633.

- Elegie 5th.* Although thy hand and fayth, and good workes too (1633, pp. 47-8).
Elegie 6th. Once and but once found in thy Companye (1633, pp. 49-51).
Elegie 7th. Here take my Picture, though I bid farwell (1633, pp. 51-2).
Elegie 8th. Sorrowe, who to this house, scarce knew the way (1633, pp. 52-3).
Elegie 9th. O, lett me not serve soe, as those men serve (1633, pp. 53-5).
Elegie 10th. Till I have Peace wth thee, warr other men.
Elegie 11th. By our first strange and fatall Interviewe.
Elegie 12th. Natures lay Ideott, I taught thee to love (1633, pp. 55-6).
Elegie 13th. Who ever loves, yf hee doe not propose.
The Storme. to Mr. Christopher Brooke (1633, pp. 56-9).
The Calme (1633, pp. 59-61).
To S^r Henry Wotton (1633, pp. 61-3).
The Crosse (1633, pp. 64-6).
Elegie on the Ladye Markeham (1633, pp. 66-8).
Eligie on M^r. Boulstred (1633, pp. 69-71).
To S^r Henry Goodyere (1633, pp. 72-4).
To M^r. Rowland Woodward (1633, pp. 74-5).
To S^r Henry Wootton (1633, pp. 76-7).
To the Countesse of Bedford (1633, pp. 77-9).
To the Countesse of Bedford (1633, pp. 79-82).
To S^r Edward Herbert. At Juliers (1633, pp. 82-4).
The Annuntiation (1633, pp. 168-9).
Goodfryday 1613. Ridinge towards Wales (1633, pp. 170-1).
A letter to the Ladye Carey and M^r. Essex Riche from Amyens (1633, pp. 112-3).
To the Countess of Salisburie. August 1614 (1633, pp. 115-18).
The Litanye (1633, pp. 172-85). [A latter hand has written at the side of this poem, "To S^r Tho: Roe."]
Songs and Sonnets [as in 1633 with occasional differences in order—the omission of *A nocturnal* (p. 187), *Witchcraft by a picture* (p. 189), and the inclusion of *Stand still and I will read to thee* (1635, pp. 65-7) and of *Elegie Autumnal* (1633, pp. 151-2)].
An Epithalamion, or Maryadge Songe, etc. (1633, pp. 118-22).
Eclogue, 1613 December 26 (1633, pp. 123-7).
Epithalamion. 1. The Time of the Marriage . . . (1633, pp. 127-35).
Obsequies to the Lord Harrington brother to the Countesse of Bedford (1633, pp. 140-8).

U.L.C. 5778 is thus one of the largest extant MS. collections of Donne's poems. It contains one poem—*The Progresse of the Soule*—of which Grierson* recognised only three MS. versions, viz. G., O'F., and that represented in the group A.₁₈, N., T.C.D., T.C.C., while the

* *Poetical Works*, vol. ii. p. 218.

rest of its contents are similar to those of the second MS. group, *D. H.*¹⁹ * *Lec.*† It may therefore be a source from which parts of both groups are derived. Further, *U.L.C.* 5778 is the only MS. extant which starts as 1633 starts, with *The Progresse of the Soule* and the two groups of *Holy Sonnets*. If, indeed, exception be made for certain elegies which the 1633 printer was at first debarred from printing,‡ and for the epigrams, which in 1633 occupy the place of the satires in *U.L.C.* 5778, the order of poems in 1633 from p. 1 to p. 84 (*The Progresse of the Soule—To Sir Edward Herbert at Julyers*) is the same as that in *U.L.C.* 5778. These facts suggested that *U.L.C.* 5778 may be a version closer to that used to set up the first part of 1633, than that of any existing MS. This is borne out by the following list, which gives the variant readings in *U.L.C.* 5778, *T.C.C.* and 1633 for every occasion on which Grierson has specially noted the reading of *T.C.C.* which he regarded as the source of the text of *The Progresse of the Soule*.§

	<i>U.L.C.</i> 5788.	<i>T.C.C.</i>	1633.
l. 10	writts	writts	writts
l. 36	vouch thou safe	vouch thou safe	vouch safe thou
l. 54	lone	love	love
l. 69	when	where	when
l. 83	[<i>om. enlive</i>]	[<i>om. enlive</i>]	enlive (<i>some copies omit</i>)
l. 94	[<i>om. rivolets</i>]	[<i>om. rivolets</i>]	[<i>om. rivolets</i>]
l. 99	here	heare	here
l. 117	breake, doe	breake, doe	breake, doe
l. 130	Earths-pores	earths pores	earths-pores (<i>some copies read earth-pores</i>)
l. 137	the Prince, & so fill'd	the Prince, and so fill'd	the Prince, and so fill'd (<i>some copies read, the Princess, and so fill'd</i>)
l. 147	middle parts	mid-parts	middle parts
l. 150	kinde	kinde	kinde
l. 180	uncloth'd	encloth'd	uncloth'd
	peck'd	peck'd	pick'd
l. 185	a new mantle downy	a new downy	downy a new
l. 214	his	his	his
l. 225	they intertouched	they intertouch'd	they intertouched

* In *Poetical Works*, vol. i. p. xxiv. List of MS. Sigla, l. 18: Harleian MS. 4944 should read 4955; cf. vol. ii. p. lxxxiii.

† Vol. ii. p. lxxxiv. *et seq.*

‡ *Ibid.*, p. lxxxvii.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 218 and p. xciv. Certain readings in which *U.L.C.* 5778 agrees with *T.C.C.* and 1633 are given for the sake of supplementing Grierson's collation, other manuscripts and editions showing variants in these passages.

	<i>U.L.C. 5778.</i>	<i>T.C.C.</i>	<i>1633</i>
l. 251	w th nature	w th her nature	w th the nature
l. 267	wether	wether	wether
l. 273	Thus doubtfull	Thus doubtfull	Thus doubtfull
l. 280	It rays'd	It rays'd	Its rais'd (<i>some copies</i> <i>read It rays'd</i>)
l. 296	That leagues at sea	That leagues at sea	That leagues o'erpast at sea
l. 322	as	as	at
l. 383	who thought nor had gone	who thought no had gone	who thought no more had gone
l. 419	nor much resist	nowe much resist	nor much resist
l. 420	not barke	not barke	nor barke
l. 480	she hath	shee have	shee hath
l. 484	now	then	nowe
l. 485	[<i>om. tooth</i>]	[<i>om. tooth</i>] *	tooth
l. 487	Tethelomite	Tethlemitte	Tethelomite
l. 505	thys Soule	a Soule	this Soule

If the four cases in which *1633* copies give varying readings be omitted it is seen that *U.L.C. 5778* agrees with *1633* sixteen times, in ten of these cases against *T.C.C.*; that *T.C.C.* agrees with *1633* in only two cases against *U.L.C. 5778*, and in one of these (l. 54) *U.L.C. 5778* is right. *U.L.C. 5778* therefore, or a MS. from which it is derived, rather than *T.C.C.* has been used to set up *The Progresse of the Soule* in *1633*.

In the *Satyres U.L.C. 5778* agree with *Lec.* and *1633* where the former differs from the other members of its group, *D* and *H₁₉*. In *Satyre III.*, l. 47, *U.L.C. 5778* reads with *1633* "the ragges" against *Lec.* "her ragges."

In the *Songs and Sonets* where Grierson has shown that a MS. of the class *D. H₁₉* *Lec.* is the source,† *U.L.C. 5778* agrees with these MSS. Like these MSS. it has the very common reading in *The Anniversarie* :

Here upon earth, we are Kings, and but wee
None are such kings, and of such subjects bee (ll. 23-4)

which shows that the printer must have had a revised copy of the poem when he set up *1633*.

U.L.C. 5778 gives us the same text as *D. H₁₉* and *Lec.* and *1633* of the *Elegies*, and in l. 159 of the *Obsequies to the Lord Harrington*, it has the same error as have the printed edition and that MS. group.

It seems certain, therefore, that a MS. from which *U.L.C. 5778* was derived is the source of *1633*. That *U.L.C. 5778* is not itself this source is proved by the facts that it omits the last ten lines of

* A later hand has inserted "loath."

† *Poetical Works*, vol. ii. p. lxxxvi.

To *S^r Ed. Herbert*, and that it has such a reading as, for l. 1 of *To S^r Henry Wotton* :

S^r, letters more then kisses, mingle Soules.

Another Donne MS. which has not been recorded is in St. Paul's Cathedral Library. It contains five satires, thirteen elegies, verse letters, the two groups of *Holy Sonnetts*, *Divine Poems*, *Songs and Sonets*, *Epithalamions*, *Obsequies to the Lord Harrington*. From the order of the poems in the MS. and in their groups, from the titles given to the *Songs and Sonets*, from the omission of poems such as *A Nocturnall upon St. Lucies Day* and *Witchcraft by a Picture*, and from a collation of the text of selected poems I conclude that this MS. belongs to the *D. H.₁₉ Lec.* class. Though, like *U.L.C.* 5778, it contains no poems which are not certainly John Donne's, this MS. is not very interesting. A previous librarian of the cathedral suggested that a cipher on the inside cover stood for JOHN DONNE. It might stand for a great many other names as well. Moreover, John Donne the elder did not so mark the books which belonged to him ; and it is exceedingly improbable that either father or son would own such an MS. without correcting its many and obvious mis-readings.

A third unedited MS. of Donne containing sermons, letters, paradoxes, problems, characters and poems, is in private hands, and a brief note on it may appear in a future number. Its inclusive character suggests to its present owner that it may have been compiled for one of Donne's noble patrons.

JOHNSON'S PART IN *THE ADVENTURER*

BY L. F. POWELL

JOHNSON, who was very zealous in promoting the success of *The Adventurer*, maintained great reticence about his own share in it. When Boswell read to him Miss Williams's account, which was that "as he had *given* those Essays to Dr. Bathurst, who sold them at two guineas each, he never would own them; nay, he used to say, he did not *write* them; but the fact was, that he *dictated* them while Bathurst wrote," he, in Boswell's words, "smiled and said nothing." Similarly, when Miss Hill Boothby inquired (December 4, 1753) if his pen had any share in *The Adventurer*, he remained silent. Miss Boothby, who was privileged, unlike Boswell, persisted and in a second letter (December 29) reminded him that he had not answered her question. Johnson relented, and in a reply, which unhappily has not been discovered, admitted the authorship of the essays signed T. We learn this from Miss Boothby's letter dated February 16, 1754. She wrote, "I wonder not at your hesitating to impart a secret to a woman; but am the more obliged to you for communicating it as a secret, after so hesitating. Such a mark of your deliberate confidence shall be strictly regarded; and I shall seek for letter T, that I may read with redoubled pleasure" (Croker's *Boswell*, 1831, iv. 529 ff.). In addition to this we have other external evidence of Johnson's authorship of these papers: (1) the statement of Sir John Hawkins "That Johnson was the writer of the papers signed T, I assert on the authority of his *Adversaria*, in which are the original hints of many of them in his own handwriting" (*Life of Johnson*, p. 293 note); (2) Dr. Joseph Warton's authoritative note, "The papers marked T were written by Mr. S. Johnson" (Chalmers *British Essayists*, 1802, vol. xxiii. p. xl).

This evidence is solid and the signature T has been generally

accepted as Johnson's. The four letters (Nos. 34, 41, 53, 62) subscribed Misargyrus, although they have Johnson's distinguishing signature, were, however, not accepted as his by Boswell, Malone, and Dr. Birkbeck Hill. It is the purpose of the present article to reconsider the question of their authorship and to discuss the part played by Johnson in the paper generally.

Boswell's account of Johnson's participation in *The Adventurer* is confused, inconsistent, and inadequate. The errors in it are mainly due to his late decision, arrived at while the *Life* was passing through the press, that the papers signed T and subscribed "Misargyrus" were not Johnson's. His proof sheets reveal the extent of his uncertainty. He first wrote :

He now relieved the drudgery of his Dictionary, and the melancholy of his grief, by taking an active part in the composition of "The Adventurer", in which he began to write March 3, marking his essay * with the signature T, by which most of his papers, in that collection, are distinguished : two, however, which have that signature, Numbers X and X, were written by Mr. Colman. But, indeed, his energy of thought and richness of language are still more decisive marks than any signature. As a proof of this, my readers will not doubt that No. 39, on sleep, is his. . . .

In first proof Boswell gave "34" and "41"—the two first Misargyrus papers—instead of the two X's, and substituted "Bonnel Thornton" for "Colman," adding "who contributed several more." He then cancelled his corrections and started afresh, replacing "two" by "those" and "Numbers . . . his" by "and also that of *Misargyrus* were not written by him, but as I suppose by Dr. Bathurst. Johnson's" (*Reproduction of Some of the Original Proof Sheets of Boswell's Life of Johnson*, printed by R. B. Adam, 1923). This is substantially as the passage was finally printed.† For the sake of completeness I reprint it in its amended, but not final form :

He now relieved the drudgery of his Dictionary, and the melancholy of his grief, by taking an active part in the composition of "The Adventurer", in which he began to write March 3, marking his essays with the signature T, by which most of his papers, in that collection, are distinguished : those however, which have that signature and also that of *Misargyrus* were not written by him but as I suppose by Dr. Bathurst. Johnson's energy [*vt. supra*].

* Corrected in proof to essays.

† It will be found in any edition at the beginning of the year 1753: the reference to Birkbeck Hill is i. 252.

It will be noticed that the date of the first Misargyrus paper, March 3, remains. He altered it in the Revise, when he substituted for it "April 10," and by so doing fell into inconsistency; for, as Dr. Hill pointed out, No. 39 was published on March 20. He also forgot to correct his statement that Johnson had, by March 8, "written only one number," which, as Mr. Chapman observes, "ceased to be intelligible when the date March 3 had been removed" (*London Mercury*, December, 1926, p. 171). April 10 is the date of Number 45, the *second* paper, excluding the Misargyrus series, signed T; Boswell's failure to give the date, March 20, of the *first*, Number 39, with that signature, as that of Johnson's initial paper is due to his use either of an incorrect edition, such as that of 1770, in which the signature is omitted, or of Sir John Hawkins's edition of the *Works*, in which the paper is not printed.*

Dr. Birkbeck Hill agreed with Boswell in refusing to accept the Misargyrus papers as Johnson's. Boswell assigned them, after much hesitation, as we have seen, to Dr. Bathurst. Dr. Hill's rejection of them was based on: (1) Johnson's statement in his letter to Warton, dated March 8, "I have no part in the paper, beyond now and then a motto": (2) internal evidence. Boswell himself offers an explanation of Johnson's statement. He says, "Even at any after period, he might have used the same expression, considering it as a point of honour not to own them."† Boswell's explanation is ingenious, but is it really necessary? When Johnson wrote, "I speak as one of the fraternity, though I have no part in the paper beyond now and then a motto," we may be sure he was telling the simple truth. I accordingly take his statement to mean that at the time of writing he was not engaged or under agreement to supply a regular number of papers. Whether there was a formal contract or agreement between the proprietor, Payne, and Hawkesworth, or Hawkesworth and "A" conjointly, made in advance of publication, I do not know; it is reasonable to suppose that there was: but it is clear from Johnson's letter to Warton that one was in contemplation. I suggest then that Johnson's statement merely tells us that on March 8, 1753, he had no part in any agreement connected with the paper,

* Dr. Hill (i. 254, note 1) was of the opinion that this paper was not wholly Johnson's. He must, with Boswell, have failed to notice that it bears Johnson's usual signature. Malone believed it was written by Bathurst "and perhaps touched in a few places by Johnson" (Boswell's *Johnson*, ed. 6, 1811, i. 232 note).

† Boswell originally wrote "upon a principle which he had assumed."

"beyond now and then a motto." * That he had agreed to provide mottoes is proved by Percy's note: "Hawkesworth usually sent Johnson each paper to prefix a motto before it was printed" (Anderson's *Life of Johnson*, ed. 3, p. 190). Dr. Birkbeck Hill's second objection to the Misargyry papers is uncompromising. He writes: "They are all below his style. They were not, I feel sure, written by him, and are improperly given in the Oxford edition of his works. I do not find in them even any traces of his hand." It is true that they are below his usual elevated style; but Dr. Burney tells us why. He writes in the third edition of the *Life* (i. 219 note): "Dr. Johnson lowered and somewhat disguised his style, in writing *The Adventurers*, in order that his Papers might pass for those of Dr. Bathurst, to whom he consigned the profits. This was Hawkesworth's opinion."

Much of this argument is, however, unnecessary, for time has produced what had eluded the diligence of Boswell and his greatest editor, and thanks to a reference in W. P. Courtney and D. Nichol Smith's *Bibliography* (p. 39), I am able to give conclusive evidence that Johnson did write two of the papers in the Misargyry series.

This evidence is contained in a letter from Payne to Dr. Warton, which I here rescue from "the recesses of an obscure and obsolete paper," † refraining from comment on those parts not relevant to the subject under consideration. The letter is dated "2 Feb." and the year is correctly given by the editor as 1754.

REV. SIR,

As your paper will not be printed till Tuesday se'nnight, I was willing to gratify your curiosity by sending *The Connoisseur* to-night. It is full of dull commonplace stuff, and is, I think, not worthy of Thornton.

It is disgusting, I own, to give such imperfect translations of passages selected for the peculiar purposes of our papers, but the Spectator, etc., began it, the unlettered expect the continuance of it, and we must gratify that expectation. The translation of the passage from Dr. M., which I sent you is radically bad and cannot be mended by alteration. We must take our chance for a translation from Mr. Johnson, which

* Since writing the above, I find that Croker took much the same view. He says, "Johnson, whether he gave some of these essays to Dr. Bathurst or not, probably did not consider himself as having, by the writing one letter, a part—that is, a proprietary or responsible part—in the paper." He also stresses the use of the "pedantic" signature as characteristic of Johnson (Croker's *Boswell*, 1831, i. 240 note).

† *Willis's Current Notes*, 1857, February, p. 13.

you must help me to procure, and which I will print after the contents of the volume in which it occurs.

Last Saturday Mr. Hawkesworth got T to supply his place; he has begged the same favour of him for Tuesday, on account of a violent pain in his face; but he does not mean that T shall lose his own turn; the state of our affairs, therefore, from last Tuesday se'nnight, stands thus:

127 Z. 128 T. for H. 129 Z. 130 H. Saturday, Feb. 2, these are published.

131 T. 132 H. 133 Z. The paper I received yesterday.

134 H. 135 T. 136 H. 137 Z. 138 H. 139 T. 140 H.

By this disposition, which H. has given me, you will not have room for your criticism on Othello, unless you can include it in one paper, which is hardly possible.

It may, therefore, be useful to wind up papers of that kind by some general subject; for Johnson says each must wind up his bottom, and not leave the world in ignorance of our design till the last paper.

Of ninety-two numbers, since you began ~~amending the whole~~ supposing the whole to be finished—

Hawkesworth will have written	39	} 43
The three signed Y were submitted for his	3	
And one signed &	1	
T will have written for his own share	23	} 25
And for Hawkesworth	2	
Which is two above his number		
Z will have written	24	
			—	
			92	

Which is one above his number, for

				} 46	Himself	39
Hawkesworth should have written	46		Y	3
					&	1
					T	2
					Z	1
T	23		
And Z	23		
				—		
				92		

I have had no contents since no. 105.

I am,

Your's sincerely,
J. PAYNE.

Payne's detailed allocation of the ninety-two numbers to the different writers is perfectly correct. From No. 49, Warton's first

paper, to No. 140, inclusive, there are : (a) thirty-nine unsigned papers, three signed Y—by Miss Mulso, afterwards Mrs. Chapone, and one signed &—by Colman ; these form Hawkesworth's contribution towards his quota of forty-six : (b) twenty-five papers with Johnson's signature T, including two in the *Misargyrus* series, numbers 53 and 62 : (c) twenty-four with Warton's signature Z. Payne's letter tells us that the papers with which Johnson supplied Hawkesworth's place were Nos. 128 and 131, dated respectively January 26 and February 5, 1754. Thus Hawkesworth's "disposition," although not carried out exactly according to plan, was successfully completed ; and if Johnson lost his turn, he did not fail to supply the amount of copy required of him. This is, I think, conclusive evidence that Johnson wrote the two last *Misargyrus* papers, and if these are his then it is reasonable to suppose that the other two in the same series, Numbers 34 and 41, are his also. The statements of Hawkins and Warton quoted at the beginning of this paper must be regarded as applicable to all the essays, twenty-nine in number, marked T. It may be added that "*Misargyrus*" is no more the signature of a paper than is "*Perdita*" (No. 74), or "*Viator*" (No. 84), or "*Dubius*" (No. 92), or "*Mercator*" (No. 102) ; it is merely the subscription to a series of letters.

Dr. Parr said that No. 87, on good breeding, "was Johnson's originally and entirely," although it has Warton's signature in the first and all the subsequent editions I have consulted. He assigned it to Johnson on internal evidence and on the ground that Wooll did not claim it for Warton. Of No. 132, which we know to be Hawkesworth's, Parr says, "there are many strong internal marks in the thoughts and the language, that Johnson had improved it largely" ; and "in No. 76 signed Z there are frequent and decisive marks of Johnson's pen." (*Parriana*.) The evidence of the signature cannot, however, be disregarded.

Although Johnson had no part in the paper on or before March 8, 1753, it is obvious from Payne's letter that at some time between that date and the middle of April he did agree to take his turn with Hawkesworth and Warton in such a manner as to supply one-fourth of the essays ; * Warton at the same time agreed to contribute

* Perhaps it is to this arrangement that Hannah More referred in 1776 : "I have got the headache to-day, by raking out so late with that gay libertine Johnson. Do you know—I did not—that he wrote a quarter of *The Adventurer* ?" (*Memoirs*, 1836, i. 56). I suppose Johnson had broken silence and spoken of his share.

another fourth, leaving the remainder to Hawkesworth. It is easy to see how this arrangement came about. Hawkesworth definitely states (No. 140):

I did not . . . undertake to execute this scheme alone; not only because I wanted sufficient leisure, but because some degree of sameness is produced by the peculiarities of every writer; and it was thought, that the conceptions and expression of another, whose pieces should have a general coincidence with mine, would produce variety, and by increasing entertainment facilitate instruction.

The services of "A" were accordingly enlisted. He started off well by contributing every third paper, but this pace was too great for him and he soon tired; he missed his turn three times and left Hawkesworth to write nine consecutive papers, coming in again with number 19; his next papers were numbers 23 (January 23), 25 (January 30), and 35 (March 6). Hawkesworth by this time realised that he could not be depended on for regular assistance and appealed for help. Hence the treaty with the author and authoress, which Johnson's letter (March 8) to Warton tells us was in the making, and Johnson's proposal to Warton in this very letter. "A's" last paper was number 43 (April 3), and the negotiations with the author and authoress, whose identity has not yet been revealed, came to nought. This accumulation of failures—"A's" incapacity, Hawkesworth's inability to carry on the work with the uncertain aid of casual supplies, and the abortive treaty, imperilled the success of the venture and convinced Payne of the necessity of inducing Johnson and Warton to collaborate with Hawkesworth.

The new arrangement probably came into being with Number 49 (April 24), Warton's first paper, when it was settled that Hawkesworth should be responsible for forty-six papers, and Johnson and Warton for twenty-three each. Payne had evidently settled in advance the number of papers required for the whole work.* "When this work was first planned," says Hawkesworth for him in the last number, "it was determined that whatever might be the success, it should not be continued as a paper till it became unwieldy as a book. . . . It was soon agreed that four volumes, when they should be printed in a pocket size, would circulate better than more, and that scarce

* Mr. Chapman reminds me that a multiplied 35 is one of the conventional figures in the make-up of these periodicals. See *R. E. S.*, Vol. III., p. 77.

any of the purposes of publication could be effected by less; the work therefore was limited to four volumes, and four volumes are now completed." *

The list of Johnson's papers, including those subscribed *Misargyrus*, is given in Courtney and Nichol Smith. It is impossible to say from the sequence in which they occur when precisely his turn came, perhaps he did not "condemn himself to compose on a stated day;" in any case we know that he provided two above his number and came to Hawkesworth's rescue when Hawkesworth was "languishing with disease."

Miss Williams's account of Johnson's generous gift of his papers to Bathurst has been quoted already. It was unknown to Hawkins. On the contrary, Hawkins states, "It is certain that Johnson retained his old maxim, that gain was the only genuine stimulative to literary exertion, and that the assistance he gave to this publication was purchased at two guineas for every number that he furnished" (*Life*, p. 310). Croker doubted the story on the ground that "Johnson was at this period in great pecuniary distress." Johnson was not at this time in great pecuniary distress—he was later, in 1756 and in 1758—but if he had been I do not think that would have prevented him from helping the man "whom he loved better than he loved any human creature" by the gift of a couple of guineas now and then. What I do find difficult to believe is, that Bathurst, who was a gentleman and a man after Johnson's own heart, should have accepted this gift every fortnight for a whole year from his friend whose straitened circumstances were well known to him. It is strange, too, that we hear nothing from other sources of the numerous occasions on which these essays were said to have been dictated by Johnson to Bathurst—we do hear from Hawkins of the single instance of Johnson's dictation of No. 81, to Hawkesworth.† On the whole I think we may be pardoned for not accepting Miss Williams's account as literally true.

The part taken by Bathurst in *The Adventurer* is obscure. Hawkins (*Life of Johnson*, p. 293) assigns the eight essays marked "A" to him, without giving his authority. In the life of Bonnell Thornton contributed to *The General Biographical Dictionary*, 1792,

* The first collected edition is of course in two volumes, folio. The second edition, "Printed by Charles Green Say, For J. Payne . . . M.DCC.LIV," is in four volumes, octavo. The passages quoted above occur in the first edition.

† *Life of Johnson*, p. 294. Hawkins says the paper, on the Admirable Crichton, was dictated from memory.

it is definitely stated that Thornton wrote them ; in the later edition of 1814-16 he is "said" to have written them. Chalmers in the Preface to *The Adventurer* (*British Essayists*, 1802, vol. xxiii. p. xxxiii) saw no reason to impeach the veracity of Sir John Hawkins, but when he came to *The Connoisseur*, he retracted his somewhat grudging assent and had "little doubt" that they were Thornton's ; he was led to this decision by internal evidence and "some information received subsequent to" his former consideration of the subject. Southey (*Life of Cowper*, i. 47) wrote : "Chalmers's opinion is strongly supported by internal evidence, which is in this instance more than ordinarily conclusive." Malone (*Boswell's Life*, 1811) attributes not only all the "A" papers, but Numbers 34 and 41 to Thornton. He did not precisely remember his authority, but believed it was Warton. Seccombe in the *D.N.B.* says vaguely of Thornton that "he also wrote papers in *The Adventurer*." It is clear that he had the "A" papers in his mind, for he writes : "From one of his papers (No. 9) seems to have originated the practical jest Thornton executed later in company with six other old Westminsters." Thus the trend of critical opinion has been against Bathurst ; but we still lack conclusive evidence that the essays distinguished by the signature A are from the pen of Bonnell Thornton. If Bathurst did not write these papers, what did he write ? Perhaps he did no more than *write* the papers *dictated* to him by Johnson. The truth probably lies hidden in that as yet untraced letter of Johnson to Miss Hill Boothby. Let us hope that this letter will be *déterré* in time for Mr. Chapman's edition. In the meanwhile we must content ourselves by saying, with Boswell, "How much this amiable man actually contributed to *The Adventurer* cannot be known."

It is satisfactory to find that *The Adventurer* was a success. Hawkesworth, having by his editorship established his literary character, received a Lambeth degree from the Archbishop of Canterbury ; Warton was gratified by a still greater honour, Johnson's sincere praise (*Letters*, No. 51) ; and Payne was rewarded by a sale which "was at first more extensive than that of the Rambler." On this last point we have concrete evidence. In December 1755 Payne sold one half-share of the copyright of the second edition to Dodsley for £120. The cost of production is set out in his receipt and is as follows :

JOHNSON'S PART IN *THE ADVENTURER* 429

"Paper and Printing at £4 4s. 0d. sheet. No. 2000.
52 sheets

218	8	0	
31	12	0	Incidents
250	0	0	

Produce of 2000 sets at £33 12s. per 100	£	s.	d.
Total expense	672	0	0
	250	0	0
Gain	422	0	0"*

We may be sure that this success was in a large measure due to the zeal and active interest displayed in the work by Samuel Johnson.

* Tregaskis, *Coxton Head Catalogue*, 919, No. 295.

ON ANGLO-AMERICAN CULTIVATION OF STANDARD ENGLISH

By J. H. G. GRATTAN

WHATEVER views one may hold as to the authority that any academy is likely to exercise over our people, the fact that a not undistinguished gathering of American and British writers and scholars has inaugurated * "an International Council of English with reference to the problems of the common language of the English-speaking countries" can scarcely be treated with indifference. One understands that the purpose of this society is not only to *further* but to *record* † the development of our common language; and upon the quality and extent of its research-work its reputation and influence will doubtless largely depend. The chief fact, however, of interest at present is that an important step has been taken towards counteracting mutual intolerance and misunderstandings in linguistic matters east and west of the Atlantic.

That the times demand a conscious cultivation of our mother-tongue is obvious enough. The writing of English is no longer confined to persons who speak King's English or who come under the direct influence of great writers; the continuity of our literary and linguistic heritage is threatened by the wide-reaching influence of the half-educated. It would appear, therefore, that we must give up regarding "good English" as merely a social or literary accomplishment, and that we must endeavour by research and by exposition to equip the masses with the ability to exercise a reasoned choice in the employment of language; in other words, that we must regard the training of the linguistic consciousness as an essential part of primary and secondary as well as of University education.

In these pursuits we can derive invaluable help from the United

* At a meeting at the Royal Society of Literature, Bloomsbury Square, June 16, 1927.

† v. Sir Henry Newbolt in the *Royal Soc. Lit. Transactions*, New Series, vol. iii.

States of America. For America has had an experience of universal education longer by at least two centuries than our own experience; she has met and conquered, in her vast alien immigrant population, far greater tides of linguistic barbarism than any we know here; she has been forced by circumstances to give more attention to the conscious cultivation of language than has hitherto been necessary in Great Britain; and she has, during the last few years, carried out more research into the facts of the living language than our own universities can show.

The fight which lies before lovers of our Anglo-Saxon culture is on both sides of the Atlantic a fight against much the same forces, and victory may well depend upon the co-operation and mutual assistance of British and American scholars and writers. The breaking down of the misconceptions and prejudices which have stood in the way of such co-operation has begun already, and largely as a result of American research; and accordingly, the ideal of a single standard language for all English-speaking peoples is no longer a chimera.

It is therefore of interest to glance at some of the common ground shared by cultivators of good English on both sides of the Atlantic, and at some of the problems with which educationists in both countries have to deal, and with which an International Council of English might usefully concern itself.

The facts and the views set forth in this article are illustrated mainly from American sources. Especially valuable to the writer has been the new journal *American Speech*,* for which he would wish a wide circulation in this country also. While essentially the mouth-piece of scholars who have made a study of their own language, this valuable and most welcome periodical opens its columns to wider circles, and may thus serve to acquaint a European with general educated American opinion.

VOCABULARY

The correlation between power over words and the individual intelligence is common knowledge, even if the depth of the linguistic poverty of inferior minds is not yet widely realised. Research in this field is being carried on vigorously in the United States,† and

* Published monthly, Baltimore. Pt. 1 appeared October 1925.

† v. Leta S. Hollingworth, *Vocabulary as a Symptom of Intellect* (*American Speech*, December 1925).

its results must inevitably there lead to a revision of the aims of primary education. Here co-operation between the two countries must be to our mutual advantage.

Misuse of Words

Although, from the nature of language itself, change is a characteristic of every living idiom, there are certain changes which it is worth while to resist.

Chief among these is the misuse of long words by the half-educated. As extreme examples of unfulfilled desire to use fine language may be cited some instances culled by an American scholar * from the works of an ultra-modern novelist: the use of *betray* for *discover*, *withal* for *although*, *communication* for *communion*, *aggrandize* for *increase*. Such abuse of language is not confined to the west of the Atlantic.

Still more common are the misuse of learned terms and the love of meaningless phrases.† In England as well as in America we are every day confronted with *complexes*, *volitions*, *reactions*, *factors*, *potentialities*, and so forth. Our politicians are said to deal with *dominant issues* and to *explore avenues*; our leaders of thought to *visualize* this and that; our business men to concern themselves with *propositions*; our artists to paint *symphonies*; our musicians to compose *cameos*; ourselves to be victims of *neurasthenia*; and everything under Heaven to *function*. Up to the present, however, we are behind the United States in the vocabularies of spiritism‡ and pseudo-philosophy.§

Thus words serve merely to delude readers into a false satisfaction with imaginary intellectual progress. The only cure would seem to be a return to the old educational ideal: read, *mark*, learn, and inwardly digest.

There is a very interesting misuse of words which does not belong to the above category, a misuse due not to any desire of appearing clever, but to a yet older human failing: taboo. As

* J. W. Beach, *The Peacock's Tail* (A.S., November 1925).

† Cf. Morris Fishbein, *The Misuse of Medical Terms* (A.S., October 1925); M. V. P. Yeaman, *Speech Degeneracy* (November 1925); Olivia Pound, *Educational Lingo* (March 1926); D. N. Lehmer, *Nick Bottom the Art Critic* (January 1926).

‡ v. Lowry C. Wimberly, *Spook English* (A.S., March 1926).

§ v. Zora Schaupp, *Psychopathic English* (A.S., July 1926).

instances may serve *lavatory, illegal operation, social evil, a certain disease*. Whether it is possible, or desirable, to check the operation of this ancient instinct may be doubted ; * but an investigation of its modern manifestations would have a more than academic interest.

The Choice of Words

It is common knowledge that the greater part of our most terse and idiomatic English is derived from the "people" rather than from the learned, and that the standard language is continually enriched by the absorption of words and phrases of once restricted vogue.

The large majority of words preserved or fresh-coined by the "people" signify concrete things or simple actions. And in such matters the inherent linguistic sense of the uneducated is often sounder than that of the learned. Words like *e.g. bus, taxi, booze, guts, dope, blurb, movies, knockout, graveyard, mouth-organ, lift* (U.S. elevator), *drains* (U.S. sewerage) are more efficient than their polysyllabic equivalents. And phrases like *e.g. phone through* and *come across* no more represent "degradation" † than do *give up, give in, ring up, send off, think out* ; and if the standard language should absorb *slack down, take on, knock off, put across*, and a hundred similar expressions from mine, factory, and forest, it will gain in forcefulness and clarity.

One may hope, therefore, that any academy which aims at settling and improving the standard of English will not adopt too exclusive an attitude towards genuine popular words and phrases ; but that it will attempt, *after carrying out the necessary research*, to show why one word is worthy, and another unworthy, of the universal currency of the standard language.

Before leaving this subject one may note with amusement the violent local enthusiasm of the linguistically untrained for *boots* or *shoes, sweets* or *candy, luggage* or *baggage, dustbin* or *garbage-can, contract* or *season-ticket*. Wireless telephony will rapidly eliminate all such local variations ; but perhaps an International Council of English may speed-up the process—presumably by the casting of lots, for it can matter little which member of such pairs shall survive,

* A contributor to *American Speech* (March 1926) humorously suggests the need of a Word Rescue League.

† This term is employed by a reviewer in the *Times Lit. Supp.*, September 2, 1926.

Slang and Standard Language

The problem of slang is a difficult one. Slang consists * chiefly of words and phrases which are suddenly substituted for the vernacular. At their inception, such expressions are often spontaneous and highly figurative; but they tend to be deliberately cultivated as a distinguishing mark of a restricted circle of initiates.† And this holds good whether they arise in mining camps, factories, ranches, playing-fields, universities, slums,‡ or fashionable drawing-rooms. Accordingly, the chief characteristic of slang is its transitoriness; for as the number of the initiated increases, so must the pride of exclusiveness diminish, and recourse must be had again to the vernacular or to new esoteric language.

The ephemeral nature of fashionable slang can be learnt from the back volumes of *Punch*; the study of less exalted forms is still in its infancy.§ But it is hard to imagine that either the futile phraseology of football and baseball reporters || and other half-educated persons of the middle classes,¶ or much of the less artificial, more figurative,** and very vigorous slang of railway-men, factory-hands, lumber-men, and miners, will be permanent enough to exercise any great influence †† on the standard language.

Yet out of the infinite variety of words and phrases which are born daily, such few as do survive the struggle for existence will re-invigorate the old stock. It might be the concern of an International Council of English to give such survivals early recognition,

* Cf. the interesting survey of opinion by H. F. Reeves in *What is Slang?* (A.S., January 1926); v. also G. P. Krapp, *The English Language in America* (New York, 1925), vol. i. ch. v.

† This is surely true even of the majority of slang-abbreviations, though primarily they are time-saving devices, e.g. M.O., H.Q., G.O.C. Cf. Dorothy Barkley, *Hospital Talk* (A.S., April 1927).

‡ Cf. H. Yenne, *Prison Lingo* (A.S., March 1927).

§ One would welcome more studies on the lines of, e.g., J. Stevens, *Logger Talk* (A.S., December 1925).

|| v. Gretchen Lee, *In Sporting Parlance* (A.S., April 1926).

¶ v. F. W. Pollock, *The Current Expansion of Slang* (A.S., December 1926); Gretchen Lee, *Trouper Talk* (October 1925); P. W. White, *A Circus List* (February 1926), *Stage Terms* (May 1926); L. C. Wimberly, *American Political Cant* (December 1926).

** v. James Stevens, *Logger Talk* (A.S., December 1925); Kate Mullen, *Westernisms* (December 1925); C. P. Loomis, *Lineman's English* (September 1926).

†† One would have to qualify this statement as regards the influence of golf and the cinema; but the vocabularies of these two essential industries belong rather to technical language than to slang. Cf. however, T. Ramsaye, *Movie Jargon* (A.S., April 1926); Anne Angel, *Golf Gab* (September 1926).

as well as to encourage investigation into the theory of this branch of language studies.

The Vocabulary of Pure Science

This is more a matter for a fully international than for a binational conference; though even here there is room for linguistic investigation by an Anglo-American Committee.

The Vocabulary of Applied Science, Technology, Trade, etc.

Here a body of recognised linguistic experts might do valuable work for our language by making clear the superiority of plain and idiomatic English words over pseudo-learned or "fancy" creations. It could give reasoned justification for what the linguistic sense of many inventors and users is already doing. This healthy linguistic instinct is seen in *e.g.* the substitution of *raincoat* for *mackintosh*, *ice-box** for *refrigerator*, *wireless* for *radiotelephony*; while its absence has produced *gyratory* instead of *roundabout* traffic.

Indeed, the majority of words and phrases which owe their formation or vogue to new, practical needs will no doubt be found—though detailed investigation has yet to be made†—to be terse, efficient, and thoroughly English. Typical of some of their various classes are *e.g.* *cablegram*, *express*, *glider*, *air-craft*, *wireless*, *cut-out*, *self-starter*, *make-up*, *headline*, *outfit*, *ragtime*, *wire-pulling*, *log-rolling*, *jingo*, *boot-legging*, *bucket-shop*, *shortage*, *out-patient*, *rum-runner*; *to dump*, *bluff*, *wire*, *phone*, and *broadcast*.

It is pleasing to note the support which short words and phrases are now receiving from the ultra-modern newspaper headline: ‡ *e.g.* *rush to aid*, *death toll*, *firm stand*.

There is, however, another side to the picture. The present century threatens us with a torrent of fancy words, which are forced at all hours on the consciousness of the average citizen. From the bastard French of the drapers § and the crazily spelled || abortions

* P. B. McDonald, in a most interesting article, *Scientific Terms in American Speech* (A.S., November 1926), informs us that "in general, American inventors appear to like longer and clumsier names than do their British colleagues."

† One would welcome other popular expositions on the lines of H. B. Bernstein's *Fire Insurance Terminology* (A.S., July 1926), and Dorothy Colburn's *Newspaper Nomenclature* (February 1927).

‡ v. H. E. Rockwell, *Headline Words* (A.S., December 1926).

§ v. Marjorie H. Nicholson and Edith Philips, *Ici on Parle—* (A.S., February 1926).

|| v. Professor Louise Pound, *The Krane for K* (A.S., October 1925).

of the cosmetic-mongers, the flood is fast spreading to every trade. The senseless but snappy, catchy, and fool-snaring creations of "the great American advertising man" * are no longer alien to these islands, and the lure of polysyllabic monstrosities † may soon be felt here also.

We may hope that the first business of a Council for English will be to preach the need of philological training in living English at our schools and Universities. It is time we abandoned the current pedagogic division of words into sheep and goats according to more or less arbitrary literary and social canons. Taught to despise his plain native words and phrases, but not yet taught to weigh words and to judge between them, the man-in-the-street loses his natural linguistic instinct, and falls a ready prey to the blandishments of the half educated.

GRAMMAR

In this branch of language we may hope for great advantage from British and American co-operation.

It is true that alarmists have imagined that in the United States democratic independence combined with wholesale alien immigration might break down the continuity of the language; and the treatment of the strong verbs has been instanced as an extreme example of the threatened disintegration. But competent American scholars have now shown the falseness of the view that the cultivated speech of America is exposed to the rivalry of a uniform uneducated norm. ‡

And if any Englishman is inclined to fancy that the forces of stability are to be found only on the east side of the Atlantic, he may remind himself that elementary education was firmly established in New England in the seventeenth century, and that on the institutions of New England the civic customs of the United States are largely based. As a deep-rooted ancient institution, the school exercises in the States a power over the masses such as is wielded by no popular institution in the Old Country; and, further, the school-

* For lists of choice American specimens v. W. H. Bonner's strikingly suggestive article *Odds Against the Ad Man* (A.S., May 1926); there is no need to quote British parallels.

† Note especially those in *-orium*: v. E. C. Hills, *Irradiation of Certain Suffixes* (A.S., October 1925).

‡ v. G. P. Krapp, *The English Language in America* (New York, 1925), especially vol. i. ch. i. Cf. also R. J. Menner, *The Verbs of the Vulgate* (A.S., January 1926).

teacher west of the Atlantic plays a part in the social and intellectual life of the community.*

Now the attitude of the American schools is, so far as the English language is concerned, ultra-conservative. Eighteenth-century ideals of "correctness" are not yet dead in the United States.

Indeed, by American standards, many idiomatic usages long sanctioned in Great Britain are still "bad grammar." Such are the construction of collective noun with plural verb, the use of *their* referring back to *every one*, the compound pronoun *these kind of*, the employment of *who* as object and of *me* as predicative.† Without attempting to justify this rigid formalism, we can recognise in it a sign of the strength of tradition in the United States.

Whether the class-consciousness, which has hitherto formed the chief force of stability in Great Britain, will continue to influence the masses, has yet to be seen. The ever-growing importance of English linguistic studies in the American Universities is worthy of our attention. To the weight of united instructed linguistic opinion which must necessarily exist in the United States in the near future, the Old Country, with its contempt for philology, will be able to oppose little but disunited prejudices. And the English-speaking democracies of Greater Britain may elect to follow trained guidance from without, failing anything but fashionable amateur guidance from the mother country.

At the present moment the risk of linguistic "disintegration" appears to be greater in England than in the United States. For if in the American schools a too rigid and formal grammar is taught, the present tendency in the elementary and secondary schools of Great Britain is to teach no grammar at all.‡

The lapse from humane studies into "more practical" instruction§ has seemingly not gone so far in America as in Great Britain, and it is not improbable that in the return to sound teaching the United States will lead the way.||

* For details consult G. P. Krapp, *loc. cit.*

† v. G. H. McKnight, *Conservatism in American Speech* (A.S., October 1925).

‡ At a meeting of teachers held in the summer of 1926 at one of our chief Universities, an Inspector of Education publicly stated that "English has no grammar"! The confounding of "grammar" with "inflections" is a prevalent modern heresy.

§ The results of our educational system do not appear to justify the prevailing view that a reasonable skill in the use of a language can be acquired casually, and without any of the persistent effort and the trained guidance which are agreed to be necessary in the case of literary taste, mathematics, or machine construction.

|| v. Professor Louise Pound, *The Value of English Linguistics to the Teacher*

Unfortunately there are still many gaps in the system of accurate and scientific descriptive grammar which alone can form a firm basis for even elementary instruction. There is however, little doubt that in the needed extensive research American scholars will have a considerable share.

Above all, we need investigation into the most important branch of English grammar: Word-Order. That the right ordering of words is not easily acquired by desultory reading or by browsing on the "best authors," is sufficiently shown by the modern relapse into parataxis, and by the all too common practice of jerking out words and phrases for the reader to sort.

There are other practical problems of syntax which might possibly be solved by collaboration between English and American philologists, One might instance the Split Infinitive,* and the modern development of the group genitive.†

But perhaps the most interesting of modern linguistic developments is the appearance of an almost Chinese syntax. As an extreme example one may quote a notice (1924) of the London General Omnibus Co.: "Wembley buses stop at all bus stop posts painted light blue." The influence of the newspaper headline on this development, e.g. "Business Men Plan Coal Peace Move," deserves further study.‡ The danger of such constructions, the sacrifice of clarity to speed (e.g. *insane discipline* for *discipline of the insane*),§ can be avoided when scholars and teachers devote more of their attention to modern English syntactical theory.

PRONUNCIATION

Extraordinary excitement is shown by the linguistically untrained when discussing unimportant differences of pronunciation.

The mutual intelligibility of the narrow circle of speakers of the

(A.S., November 1925); and Professor A. P. McKinlay, *Quo Vadimus* (February 1926). Cf. also J. M. Steadman, Jr., *The Language Consciousness of Students* (December 1926).

* G. O. Curme's short article *The Split Infinitive* (A.S., May 1927) not only shows the right approach to this problem, but gives a valuable hint as to what constitutes ideal progress in language.

† v. O. Jespersen, *Progress in Language*, ch. viii.; *Chapters in English*, ch. iii.; *Language*, ch. xviii. § 8. Cf. Josephine M. Burnham, *Group Genitives* (A.S., November 1926).

‡ v. F. F. Beirne, *Newspaper English* (A.S., October 1926); H. E. Rockwell, *Headline Words* (December 1926).

§ v. S. T. Byington, *The Attributive Noun Becomes Cancerous* (A.S., October 1926).

King's English is not in the least impaired by the fact that some of them pronounce, *e.g.*, *loss*, *plant* with a long, and others with a short vowel; that some of them would rhyme, *e.g.* *launch* with *branch*, and others with *paunch*; that some of them might rhyme the suffix *-ing* with *sing*, and others with *sin*; that some of them give front-stress and others end-stress to *e.g.* *details* and *magazine*. Mutual intelligibility begins to be impaired when some of them reduce *e.g.* *law* and *lore*, or *tar*, *tower*, and *tire* to homophones.

If one goes beyond this narrow circle and listens to conversation between persons whose speech shows slight local traces of *e.g.* Glasgow, Manchester, Romford, Bristol, or Kensington, one does not observe that the many variations of intonation, vowel quality and quantity, consonant value, etc., hinder easy mutual comprehension; rather is it certain that the majority of the speakers and hearers are normally unconscious of these diversities.

Of course there are some similar variations in the speech of educated United States citizens. Some happen to accord with educated London pronunciation, some with educated Liverpool pronunciation. Others again, as for example the inverted *r*,* are found among us only in provincial dialects.

If everybody could broadcast as well as listen-in, there is small doubt that all extreme variations, British and American, would soon disappear. But until all attain this freedom of communication, the masses must continue to be guided by the few. It would be well if we could ensure that this few should include neither Cockneys who turn diphthongs into triphthongs, nor such peers, prelates, and pedagogues as do not trouble to distinguish between *corus* and *cars*, *hear* and *yah*.†

Excellent work in the direction of a clear and uniform pronunciation is already being done by the Advisory Committee of the British Broadcasting Corporation. There is a risk, however, that a committee of only six members will tend to press a too rigidly uniform and a too personal and local pronunciation upon the listeners-in of these islands, and will thus widen the gaps between England, Greater Britain, and the United States.

It ought not to be impossible for an Anglo-American Council,

* If any cultured Briton feels superior about his pronunciation of *r*, let him note that if it is of the Kensington type he will find it again among the "coloured gentlemen" of the U.S.A., as well as among the lower classes of Berlin.

† *v.* the amusing specimens given by Claude de Crespigny in his article *English English* (*A.S.*, November 1926).

in command of the necessary funds, to sort out and pillorise such varieties of pronunciation in both countries as hinder intelligibility or are obviously cacophonous. With the co-operation of our Public Schools and the Universities of both countries, an attempt might then be made to "care nationally about internationally beautiful speech," and to cultivate "world-wide forms which sound well wherever English is spoken." *

SPELLING

The popularisation of phonetics has blinded many to the advantage of the present traditional system, serving as it does to express the essential fact of language, viz. meaning, removed from the accidents of five-score differences of pronunciation. It has blinded many also to the advantage of variant spellings for homophones, and of fixed spellings for certain functionally constant (*e.g.* -ed, -s) though phonetically variable elements.

In this matter of spelling one may take comfort from the knowledge that the great weight of educated American opinion remains on the side of tradition.† The activities, therefore, of "simplified spelling" societies on both sides of the Atlantic are not an immediate menace.

But the ground is being prepared for such activities in the future by British slackening of respect for tradition. Our ambitious elementary-school curricula are apparently too crowded to include orthography; and the results of this neglect are beginning to be felt in our Universities. Further, the widespreading distortion of words for advertising purposes can hardly fail to weaken the spelling habits even of educated persons.

That some small measure of conservative spelling-reform is desirable, may be admitted. And it might well begin with the adoption of certain American usages; for the "American" spellings which so distress some of our non-philologists tend towards regularity and simplification, and are yet in no sense revolutionary.

But here a wealthy Anglo-American Council might, by a complete survey of the historical development, prepare the ground for the establishment of the principles upon which sound reform may be based.

* Quoted from Marguerite de Witt, *Stage versus Screen* (A.S., January 1927).
 † v. G. P. Krapp, *op. cit.*, pp. 328-350.

SPELLING-PRONUNCIATION

It is perhaps worthy of consideration whether the main discrepancies between English pronunciation and spelling cannot best be avoided, not by any radical departure from the spellings which embody two hundred years and more of literary tradition, but by deliberate encouragement of the long-existing tendency which has just turned *Daintry* into *Daventry*.

With us there are strong social barriers to the process. In the case of Place-names every Englishman prides himself on his knowledge of the "correct" pronunciation of some dozens of words, in happy ignorance of the fact that there remain hundreds of names for which he himself knows only "spelling-pronunciations." In the United States this social superstition is less widespread; there is there, *e.g.*, a town spelled and pronounced *Wooster*, and another spelled *Worcester* and pronounced something like *War-cestor*.

But spelling-pronunciation in present-day English is by no means confined to Place-names. If it is still a social crime in a number of words, such as *often*, *clerk*, and *forehead*, it is taking place or has taken place already, silently and unacknowledged, in a far greater number of words, such as *issue*, *lute*, *route-march*, *prowl*, *bowls*, *joist*, *bomb*, *conduit*, *hovel*, *combat*, and dozens more that are familiar to every student of the subject.

Thorough investigation of this phenomenon under the guidance of an expert Anglo-American Council might lead to interesting and profitable results.

It is probable that many of the views set forth in the above sketch will meet with reasoned opposition. The article was written chiefly in the hope of provoking discussion of problems usually avoided in cultured English circles. For if the new International Council of English works modestly and scientifically it will deserve the support of wider circles; and if it adopts an *ex cathedra* attitude it will need their active opposition.

In conclusion, may one venture the opinion that if, as the great Michael Bréal has so well expressed it, language is "the most necessary instrument of civilisation," a nation that devotes intelligent care to its own tongue will gain its reward?

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

ON THE DEATH OF DR. ROBERT LEVET—A NOTE ON THE TEXT

JOHNSON's famous tribute to his friend appeared first in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for August 1783, and is in the following form :

Condemn'd to hopes delusive mine, As on we toil from day to day, By sudden blasts, or slow decline, Our social comforts drop away.	
Well tried through many a varying year, See LEVET to the grave descend ; Officious, innocent, sincere, Of ev'ry friendless name the friend.	5
Yet still he fills affection's eye, Obscurely wise, and coarsely kind ; Nor, letter'd arrogance, deny Thy praise to merit unrefin'd.	10
When fainting nature call'd for aid, And hov'ring death prepar'd the blow, His vig'rous remedy display'd The power of art without the show.	15
In misery's darkest cavern's known, His useful care was ever nigh, Where hopeless anguish pour'd his groan, And lonely want retir'd to die.	20
No summons mock'd by chill delay, No petty gain disdain'd by pride, The modest wants of ev'ry day The toil of ev'ry day supplied.	
His virtues walk'd their narrow round, Nor made a pause, nor left a void ; And sure th' Eternal Master found The single talent well employ'd.	25
The busy day, the peaceful night, Unfelt, uncounted, glided by ; His frame was firm, his powers were bright, Tho' now his eightieth year was nigh.	30

Then with no throbbing fiery pain,
 No cold gradations of decay,
 Death broke at once the vital chain,
 And forc'd his soul the nearest way.

35

The poem was next printed in the *London Magazine* for September 1783, and apart from differences of typography and punctuation, the following variants occur :

- l. 17 : *caverns* for *cavern's* (this is a correction of an obvious misprint).
- l. 19 : *When* for *Where* ; *the* for *his*.
- l. 33 : *throbs of fiery pain* for *throbbing fiery pain*.
- l. 36 : *free'd* for *forc'd*.

On the other hand, the version in the *Annual Register* for 1783 has the same text as that of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, except for the correction of *cavern's* to *caverns*.

Johnson died in 1784, and in 1785 there appeared the first collected edition of his poetical works. Here there are a few small changes :

- l. 11 : *letter'd arrogance* is not printed, as it should obviously be, between commas.
- l. 17 : *cavern*.
- l. 33 : *no fiery throbbing pain*.

In the "new edition" of the poems, also published in 1785, another change occurs :

- l. 9 : *fill'd* for *fills*.

Mrs. Piozzi's *Anecdotes*, published in 1786, contained one stanza only, the fifth :

In misery's darkest caverns known,
 His useful care was ever nigh,
 Where hopeless anguish pours her groan
 And lonely want retires to die.

Here, in the last two lines, the past tense is changed to the present and *anguish* becomes feminine.

In 1787 Sir John Hawkins published two versions, one in his edition of Johnson's *Collected Works*, the other in his *Life*.

In the poem as printed in the *Works*, Levet is described as "Mr. Robert Levet, a Practiser in Physic," and the following points may be noted in the text :

- l. 17 : *cavern*.
- l. 33 : *no fiery throbbing pain*.
- l. 36 : *freed*.

In the version in the *Life*, there are further variations :

- l. 3 : *blast*.
- l. 11 : *ignorance* (an obvious mistake to which Boswell calls attention).
- l. 17 : *caverns*.
- l. 33 : *throb of fiery pain*.
- l. 36 : *freed*.

In the 1789 edition of Johnson's *Poetical Works* the editor reverts in the main to the original text of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, except that in l. 17 he reads *cavern*, and in l. 33 *fiery, throbbing pain*. Finally there is the version in Boswell's *Life*,* in which we find :

- l. 3 : *blast for blasts*.
- l. 18 : *ready help for useful care*.
- l. 22 : *gains for gain*.
- l. 28 : *His single talent for The single talent*.
- l. 33 : *throbs of fiery pain for throbbing fiery pain*.
- l. 36 : *freed for forc'd*.

Any text quoted by Boswell is liable to become a *textus receptus*, but what is Boswell's authority for *ready help* and *His single talent*? It may be conjectured that Boswell used the *London Magazine*, to which he was a frequent contributor. This would justify his versions of ll. 33 and 36, but not the other variants. Or did he rely in part upon Johnson's verbal repetition of the lines? In a footnote he records that Johnson repeated l. 20 as

And Labour steals an hour to die,

but that he " afterwards altered it to the present reading."

Johnson gave a MS. version of the poem to Miss Reynolds, but the only variant which Birkbeck Hill records in her transcript (*shock'd* for *mock'd* in l. 21) is an obvious error.† Of the printed versions, only three (those in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the *London Magazine*, and the *Annual Register*) can have been seen by Johnson, and it is doubtful whether he saw any but the first. Certainly he would not have passed *the groan* in l. 19 of the *London Magazine* text. The editor of the 1825 edition of Johnson's *Works* appears to have recognised the authority of the *Gentleman's Magazine* text, except in ll. 33 and 36, where he reads *no fiery throbbing pain* and *freed*. This course has been followed in later editions by Methuen Ward (1905), and by Mr. Nichol Smith in the *Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse* (1926).

* Hill, iv. 137.

† *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ii. 250.

Fiery, throbbing pain is certainly the more euphonious phrase, but may not the expressive jerkiness of *throbbing, fiery pain* have been deliberate?

Freed is clearly a more natural word than *forc'd* in the last line, and here it is reasonable to conjecture a printer's error. In Johnson's upright handwriting the two words would have a very similar appearance.

The text, therefore, of the *Gentleman's Magazine* should be restored, subject to the correction of what is certainly a printer's error in l. 17, and of what may very likely be a similar error in l. 36.

S. C. ROBERTS.

EARLY TUDOR DRAMA

PROFESSOR A. W. REED has done a notable service for Tudor drama in issuing his book, which I was glad to see so admirably reviewed in the last issue of the *Review of English Studies* by Professor J. M. Manly. The book is so good that I trust I may be pardoned for pointing out some slips, e.g. "Peyes" for "Rayes" (p. 4); "July 6" for "July 5" (p. 47); "July 10th" for "July 28" (p. 61); "September 1529" for "October 22" (p. 78).

Professor Reed refers to William Forrest, a priest musician, and he quotes from Warton that this "simple and unlearned" clergyman (who is described by Davey as "a rigid Papist") had "a Christ Church pension of £6 in 1555." The fact is that Forrest was given the Christ Church pension on July 26, 1546, he being then a petty Canon of Oxford Cathedral. Not only did he write a poem on Queen Katherine ("the Second Gresield"), but he also wrote the "Ballad of the Marigolde" for Queen Mary, that was licensed for printing in 1569-70 (Arber's *Transcripts*, 1-409), and which is given in Professor Hyder E. Rollins' *Old English Ballads*, 1553-1625.

In regard to the martyrdom of B. German Gardiner on March 7, 1544, Professor Reed states that he could trace no report of the Commission appointed on April 12 "to take over the estates and goods of the condemned men," but from the *Cal. Lett. & Papers, Hen. VIII.*, I find that on June 14, 1544, Thomas Sternhold (the

psalm compiler) was granted "the interest which German Gardiner had in the Manor of Merton and the Warren of Wyllersley, and of Ashley and Holgroves, Hants."

It is scarcely correct to write that Sebastian Westcott was ousted at St. Paul's in 1563, as is implied: "But Grindal won the day, probably because of Sebastian's position as Master of the Choristers." As a fact, though Westcott was deprived of his Subdeanship or first Minor Canonry he continued as Master of the Choristers of St. Paul's Cathedral until his death on April 5, 1582.

Professor Reed tells us that William Rastell, in April, 1534, "dropping the now dangerous craft of printing, devoted himself to the study of law." This statement needs rectification, for B. German Gardiner's letter to a friend in regard to Frith is dated from Esher, August 1, 1534, and was printed by W. Rastell in Flete Street. Another item of interest (unnoticed by Professor Reed) connected with B. German Gardiner, is that he was immediately connected with the More circle, having married Alice Daunce, daughter of Elizabeth Daunce, one of the daughters of Blessed Thomas More.

I should have liked that Professor Reed had elaborated John Rastell's stay in Ireland for two years, 1517-1519, and it might also have been hinted that Thomas Berthelet, who accompanied Rastell, did some printing in Waterford at that period—but I presume this was outside the scope of the book, which, as Professor Manly says, "is, and will long remain, absolutely indispensable to the student of the drama in England."

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

THE WILL OF JOHN BACON

I HAVE been asked to print the Will of John Bacon, which will be found below. It has been taken from the document preserved at Somerset House (P.C.C. 16 Chaynay). Its importance lies in the fact that it provides one of the vital links in the chain of evidence that goes to prove the existence of an actual marriage between Elizabeth Breton and Edward Boyes before she married George Gascoigne.

I quoted from this will on p. xvi of my Introduction to *A*

Hundreth Sundrie Flowres. It does not of course, taken by itself, prove that Elizabeth Breton married Edward Boyes, but must be studied in conjunction with three other documents. These are :

- (1) The Will of William Breton, which proves that he (Breton) married Elizabeth Bacon, the daughter of John Bacon.*
- (2) A petition to Sir Nicholas Bacon by George Gascoigne and his wife Elizabeth, which proves that she was the widow of William Breton.†
- (3) A petition to Sir Nicholas Bacon by George Gascoigne, in which it is definitely stated that the question as to whether Elizabeth was the wife of Boyes or Gascoigne was then pending trial, and was to be decided by Mr. Dr. Weston and two others.‡

William Breton died some time before March 13, 1558-9,§ on which date his will was proved. When therefore his father-in-law, John Bacon, in his will written on April 7, 1559, leaves legacies to "my doughter Boyes" and to "Mr. Boyes my sonne in Lawe," there does not seem to be any reasonable doubt that the widow Elizabeth Breton married Edward Boyes quite openly some time between Breton's death and the date on which her father made his will.

P.C.C. 16 Chaynay. *Will of John Bacon.*

T(estamentum) Joh(ann)is Bacon.

In the name of god amen. The VIIth day of Aprill in the yere of our Lord god a thousande fyve hundreth LIX and in the first yere of the Reign of our sovraign Lady Quene Elizabeth I John Bacon of Bury saynt Edmonds in the countie of Suff gentilman being of good and p(er)fitt Remembraunce thanked be god / do ordeyn and make this my last will and Testame(n)t in man(ner) and fourme following / first I comende my soule to god who of his omnipotencie made yt and of his infinite m(er)cy Redemed yt / and by the same m(er)cyfull Redempcion and myn undoubted hope is he will save yt / And my body I will be buried according to the order of the church in such sorte as shall best like myn

* Cf. *R.E.S.*, vol. 2, No. 5 (January 1926), p. 36; and vol. 2, No. 6 (April 1926), p. 166.

† Cf. *R.E.S.*, vol. 2, No. 6 (April 1926), p. 166 (note), in which P.R.O. Chancery Series II., Eliz. 71/71 is quoted.

‡ Cf. *R.E.S.*, vol. 2, No. 6 (April 1926), p. 171 (note).

§ Professor Schelling in his *The Queens Progress and other Elizabethan Sketches* (p. 29), states that William Breton died on January 12, 1559, but gives no authority. If we may take this as correct we observe that three months elapsed between Elizabeth's widowhood and her appearance as the wife of Boyes. This would give ample time for a perfectly legal and properly conducted marriage.

executors / And as Towching the dispocion of my goodes and c(h)atalls I will and bequeath to George my sonne nyne hundreth poundes of lauffull money of England / in consyderacion of suche landes T(eneme)nts and hereditame(n)ts as I have sold that was left to me by my father and shuld have discended unto hym if that I had not sold yt / And the saied nyne hundred poundes I will to be paied to my saied sonne at th(e)age of Twentie and one yeres yf he be then lyving / Item I give and bequethe also to my saied all (sic) my p(ar)te Title and interest in the ferme and leasse of wrethin (Qy. Wretham ?) in the countie of Norff w(it)h th(e) appurtenn(en)ces and all my right Title interest and possession of all the Shepe Lambes and other stocke feding being going or belonging to in or uppon the same fferme at the day of my deathe to be delyv(er)ed to my saied sonne by myn executors at or before th(e)age of one and twentie yeres / Item I give also to my saied sonne all my plate Jewells howshold and apparrell to be delyv(er)ed to hym at th(e)age of XXI yeres except suche parcells as hereafter be specified other wise disposed / Item I give to my daughter Dorothye two hundreth poundes of lauffull money of England to be paied unto her at the daye of her mariage yf she be then XVIth yeres of age / but yf she contynewe unmarried / Then I will that the saied two hunderthe poundes be paied unto her at th(e) age of XXI yeres / I give and bequeth also unto my saied daughter my late wiffe her mothers Apparell now Remaynyng and lefte / Item I give and bequeth to my daughter Boyes my daughter ffofall and to my saied daughter Dorothye my chayne of gold equally to be devyded emongst theym / And yf any of theym dye before me then I will the an(y) lyvers to have the whole / Item yf my saied sonne George dye before he come to his age of XXI yeres / Then I will that foure hunderthe poundes ov(er) and beside the two hunderthe poundes aforesaid be w(it)hin sixe monethes next after his deathe paied to my saied daughter Dorothe yf she be maryed and eightene yeres olde or ells yf she shall contynewe unmarried then to be paied to her at her age of XXI yeres / And then I will also two hunderthe markes of lauffull money of England to the mariage of one of my brother Georges sonnes which he will and all my howshold stuf and plate to my daughter Dorothye / And all myn apparrell to my bretheren George and ffrauncs / And yf my saied daughter Dorothye dye before suche tyme as the saied two hunderthe poundes is to be paied unto her as is aforesaid then I will and bequeth the same unto my sonne George to be paied unto him at his saied age of XXI yeres / And yf the saied George my sonne and the saied Dorothye my daughter shall bothe dye before the tyme appoynted for the recept of their legac(ie)s / Then I will two hunderthe poundes / parte of the same legac(ie)s to my saied brother Georges sonnes which he shall thinke best / to be paied wythin one yere next following the death of the Longer lyver of theym / And then I will that my brother ffrauncs shal have all myn interest right and Title in the leasse and Stocke of Catal at wrethin aforesaid / Item I give bequethe two parts of all my landes Tenements and hereditaments w(it)h th(e)appurten(en)ces in three partes equally to be devyded to myn executors and their Assignes untill my saied sonne George shall come to the full age of XXIth yeres to take

and receyve the profitts thereof to th(e)intente there w(it)h honestly to fynde and maynteyne my saied doughter Dorothye and the rest ov(er) and besydes her fynding to give yt unto her at the day of her mariage / Item I give and bequethe to John Barker my serv(a)nt twentie shillings / To Will Sigar my serv(a)nt fyve poundes that he oweth me / To Anne Humffrey That was my serv(a)nte Twentie shillings / Item I guve to myn Executors Twelve poundes of lafull money of England equally be devyded emongst them / Item I give to my brother frauncs Bacon two Aungells and to my sonne ffofall two Aungells And to Mr. Boyes my sonne in Lawe Two Aungells to make theym Ryngs / Item to the Sup(er)visors of this my last will and Testament fyve poundes / Item I give to John Holte of Bury gent my blacke harneys furnyshed as yt is / Item I give to Thom(as) Badby gent thre Aungells to make hym a Ringe / And to his wif one Aungell And to John Eyer Esquyer thre Aungells / Item yf my saied sonne George and my saied doughter Dorothye dye before the saied tyme before lymyted for their bequests Then I will their parts and legac(ie)s aforesaid / except such portion before bequethed be equally devyded amongst my graundechildern And yf my saied sonne George dye and my saied doughter Dorothie lyve / Then I will all yt porcion and legac(ie)s of my saied sonne excepte such porcion afore gyven to my saied doughter or otherwise disposed be equally devyded betwene my saied doughter Dorothie and my graundechildern / Item I give to the gov(er)nors of the ffree gramer Schole in Bury saynt Edmunds in the countie of Suff to th(e) use of the same Schole thre poundes six shillings eight pence / Item I give and bequeth to my saied sonne George all my goodes Catalles and Somes of money nowe in my custodie or to me by any p(er)son owing or hereafter to be paid after my ffun(er)alls honestly p(er)fourmed my debtes paied and my legac(ie)s of this my last will and Testament fully and wholly p(er)fourmed / Item I ordeyn and make my sonne George Bacon my brother George Bacon of Heggesset in the countie of Suff gentilman and Thomas Androwes of Bury Saynt Edmunds in the saied countie of Suff gentilman Executors of this my last will and Testament / Item I ordeyn and make the right honorable Sir Nicholas Bacon knyght Lord Keper of the great seall of England Sup(er)visor of this the same my last will and Testament John Bacon / p(er) me George Bacon by me Thomas Androwes /

Probatum fuit suprascriptum Testamentum coram Mag(ist)ro Waltero Haddon Legum doctore Curie p(ro)rogative Cant Custode sive Commissario sede Archiepali Cant jam vacan X^o die mensis Maii Anno d(omi)ni mill(esi)mo quingentesimo quinquagesimo nono Juramento Georgii Bacon de Heggesset et Thome Androwes executorum Quibus etc Ad sancta dei Evangelia Jurato etc. Reservata p(ote)state etc Georgio Bacon filio d(icti) defuncti ac ex cum venerit.

B. M. WARD.

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CORRECTION *

IN Mrs. Aphra Behn's *The Emperor of the Moon* (1687) the doctor's humour is described as a result of "reading foolish Books, *Lucian's Dialogue of the Lofty Traveller*, who flew up to the Moon, and thence to Heaven; an heroick Business, call'd *The Man in the Moon*, if you'll believe a *Spaniard*, who was carried thither, upon an Engine drawn by wild Geese; with another Philosophical Piece, *A Discourse of the World in the Moon*; with a thousand other ridiculous Volumes, too hard to name."

Mr. Summers in his note on this passage correctly identifies Lucian's dialogue as the *Icaromenippus*; *The Man in the Moon* as Bishop Francis Godwin's *The Man in the Moone: or a discourse of a Voyage thither by D. Gonzales* (1638); but he erroneously explains *A Discourse of the World in the Moon* as Cyrano de Bergerac's *Selenarchia* (in Greek characters), or *the Government of the World in the Moon. A Comical history . . . Done into English by T. St. Serf* (London, 1659), or *The Comical History of the States and Empires of the Worlds of the Moon and Sun . . . newly Englished by A. Lovell* (London, 1687).†

Mrs. Behn's title refers rather to Bishop John Wilkins' *The Discovery of a World in the Moone. Or a Discourse Tending to prove that 'tis probable there may be another habitable World in that Planet* (London, 1638). This work, much more "a Philosophical Piece" than Cyrano's, was republished in 1640 as *A Discourse concerning a New World and Another Planet*, this being the general title covering *The Discovery of a World in the Moone* and a new book, *A Discourse Concerning a New Planet*.‡ The *Discourse of the World in the Moon* in *The Emperor of the Moon* would appear to be a shortening of one of these titles.

It is entirely possible that it is to the voyages of Cyrano among others that Mrs. Behn refers by "a thousand other ridiculous Volumes, too hard to name." But, although there are some lines

* *The Works of Aphra Behn*, edited by Montague Summers (London, 1915), vol. iii. p. 399 and notes, p. 496.

† A full bibliography of French editions is given by M. Frédéric Lachèvre, *Les Œuvres Libertines de Cyrano de Bergerac* (Paris, 1921). No French edition has a title resembling "A Discourse of a World in the Moon."

‡ The first book purports to be the third edition of the 1638 publication. I am unable to find the second edition.

in the play that might have been inspired by *Cyrano*, there is not sufficient evidence to establish his work as a direct source.

It may not be out of place to mention here that Mrs. Behn was the second English translator of Fontenelle's *Entretiens sur la Pluralité des Mondes* (1686).*

R. E. BENNETT.

SHADWELL AND THE OPERATIC *TEMPEST*†

I MUST apologise to Mr. Thorn-Drury for mistaking the precise point which he seeks to establish, namely, that *The Tempest* "was already an opera" before the production of the version as it appears in the 4to of 1674, and that in consequence the question whether Shadwell had any hand in the latter is of relatively small importance. It appears, however, that this conjecture is intimately bound up with the general question of the authorship of the 4to of 1674, and I should therefore be glad to have space to reply briefly to some of the comments on my note.

In order to refute the arguments adduced by Mr. W. J. Lawrence in support of Downes's statement, that the play was "made into an Opera by Mr. *Shadwell*," Mr. Thorn-Drury has to postulate a hypothetical version supposed to have been made by Dryden at some time between 1670 and 1674. The fact that there is no definite evidence for the existence of such a version seems to me to constitute the essential weakness of the theory. The version associated with Purcell's name cannot be regarded as analogous to the 1674 version, or to Mr. Thorn-Drury's hypothetical version, for there is no reason to suppose that the Purcell additions made any significant change in the piece. All that can certainly be attributed to Purcell is one new song,‡ which the publishers apparently did not think of sufficient importance to insert in the text.

* *The Theory or System of several new Inhabited Worlds lately discover'd, and pleasantly describ'd. . . . Written in French, Made English by Mrs. Behn* (London, 1700). (Note also that here Mrs. Behn borrows *discovered* from Wilkins' title.) Glanvil made the first English translation.

† See previous notes, *R.E.S.*, i. 327-330; ii. 463-466; iii. 204-208.

‡ Cf. W. Barclay Squire, "Purcell's Dramatic Music," *Sammelbande der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, V. iv (1904), 553.

Mr. Thorn-Drury complains that I did not explain the allusions in some of the passages which he quotes ; * but he himself ignores the crucial question as to why the 1670 version appears in the 1701 Folio. It is somewhat surprising to find that he describes the collections of Dryden's works, dated 1691, 1693, and 1695, as "editions," consisting as they do of mere assemblages of the separate 4to plays bound together by the publishers. The presence of the 1674 version in these collections may easily be explained by the fact, admitted by Mr. Thorn-Drury, that the 1670 text "had long been out of print." On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the 1701 Folio is a genuine edition of the poet's works, however faulty in minor textual details. If it be considered unlikely that Dryden himself had any hand in preparing this edition, it is at least probable that his son and executor, Charles, who must have known what his father wrote, took a practical interest in its preparation.† In any case, whoever was responsible must have had good reason for hunting out a copy of the 1670 version ; obviously the line of least resistance would have been to reprint the well-known 1674 version.

Congreve's belated Duodecimo edition can scarcely rank with the Folio as authoritative. There is no evidence that Congreve personally supervised its preparation ; he seems to have been afflicted with blindness and other ills at the time, and had probably forgotten, if he had ever been aware of, the distinction between the two versions of *The Tempest*.

Mr. Thorn-Drury states that I seem "entirely to miss" the whole point of the quotation from the Preface to *Albion and Albanus* : "that in them Dryden is discussing *opera* and nothing else, and is introducing *The Tempest* as a successful example of that class of composition." I would point out (1) that Dryden does not explicitly claim the "opera" as his own, and (2) admitting that he implies it to be so, he is careful to distinguish it from a true opera by describing it as a "Tragedy mix'd with Opera" ; the fact that his own 1670 version, itself not without an admixture of opera, forms the basis of the 1674 version is surely not altogether irrelevant.

Finally, I would remark that I was fully aware that "Author Punch" is a nickname which might possibly have been applied to

* As regards the allusion in the Epistle to the Reader before *The Careless Lovers*, it may be suggested that the writer had in mind the operatic version of *Macbeth*, acted at Dorset Gardens, February 18, 1672-3.

† Pointed out to me, in a private communication, by Mr. Lawrence.

Dryden; what I wished to emphasise was that it is extremely unlikely that Dryden should have been reduced to preparing drolls for Bartholomew Fair. If the allusion is neither to Shadwell nor to Dryden, with whom, it may be asked, does Mr. Thorn-Drury identify "Author Punch"?

D. M. WALMSLEY.

UNFRACTURED FORMS IN THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ESSEX PLACE-NAMES

§ 1. IN the course of an article on the early London dialect (*Englische Studien*, 59 (3), August 1925), Mr. Reaney comes to the conclusion that the Essex place-name forms in F.F. [Essex Feet of Fines] "reveal the London, and not the local forms" (p. 345); in a second article (*Englische Studien*, 60 (1), December 1926), he notes that these forms normally show fracture in the M.E. period, yet in F.F. there occurs a certain number of thirteenth-century forms which do not, e.g. *Aldecote*, *Oldeden*, etc. This fact, he thinks, shows that the non-Saxon type was already predominant in London and suggests that the Essex *eld-* forms in F.F. are due either to direct copying from earlier records or to contemporary local Essex influence (p. 18).

§ 2. Yet most of the thirteenth-century Pl.-N. forms with *-ald-*, *-old-*, etc., in the Essex F.F. are capable of an explanation which Mr. Reaney appears to have overlooked. I eliminate from the following discussion all family names such as *de Oldewell*, *Holefold*, etc., based on Pl.-Ns. which do not with certainty belong to Essex.

In the thirteenth-century Essex F.F. the names of actual places with the *ald-*, *old-* type are: *Aldeberifeld*, *Aldecote*, *Aldefeld*, *Aldeham*, *Oldeden*, *Caudewell* and *Northwaude*, *Suthwaude*, *Wald*, etc.

§ 3. If, however, we inquire into the precise geographical position of the places bearing these names, it appears that practically all of them lie in North Essex, along the Cambs.-Suffolk border.

Aldeberifeld is "in Clavering" (Essex F.F., vol. i. p. 104); *Aldecote* is "in Colun," i.e. Colne (*ibid.*, p. 51); *Aldefeld* is "in Elmsted" (*ibid.*, p. 163); *Aldeham* is near Lexden and Tey (*ibid.*, p. 151); *Oldeden* is in the "town Cestreford," i.e. Great Chesterford (*ibid.*, p. 115).

§ 4. There is ample evidence in M.E. that both Cambs. and Suffolk were non-fracture areas. Thirteenth-century Pl.-N. forms from Cambs. are: *Caldecote*, *Caldewell*, *Calverebreg*, *Calwyscroft* (all in Hundred Rlls.), *Coldham*, *Aldewincle* (*Liber Memor. ecclesie de Bernwelle*, ed. Clark, 1907), etc.; from Suffolk: *Caldecotes*, *Aldefreche*, *Holdehawe* (from the Hundred Rlls.), *Caldewell*, *Brychtwaldesfeld* (Cat. Anc. Dds.), *Oldallefeld*, *Oldemor*, *Oldewode* (Cal. Inquisit. P.M.), etc.; and the only exception which I have noted is *Heldemedede*, 1272 (Cal. Inquisit. P.M.). Now this place lies on the Essex border near Higham, and in such border areas we should expect to, and do indeed as a rule, find instances which show that types from both of the contiguous dialects are current.

§ 5. The occasional unfractured Pl.-N. forms from Essex, cited in § 3, show the influence of the neighbouring dialects of Cambs. and Suffolk. They must be regarded as typical of the border area of North Essex, and there is not the slightest reason for putting them down as London forms. In this connexion, it is interesting to note the North Essex text *Vices and Virtues*, c. 1200 (written probably in the neighbourhood of Saffron Walden), has precisely the same occasional traces of unfractured forms, e.g. *cold*, pp. 107, 109; *alder*, p. 111; *onfald*, p. 41; *hald*, p. 61, as are found in the spellings of North Essex Pl.-Ns., though in *V. & V.* the typical Essex forms with fracture largely predominate.

§ 6. Throughout the rest of Essex the fracture-type prevails in Pl.-Ns.—*Eldefeld*, *Heldeheye*, *Eldebery*, *Chalvedone*, *Chalfwurd*, etc. The only exceptions are occasional early forms in the Essex F.F. of the modern Chadwell and North and South Weald. Influence from non-fracture areas cannot have operated here. Fracture would normally not appear in unstressed *-wald*, as a second element, *-weld* being due here to the influence of the normal type of the independent word. The forms *Caudewell*, *Caldewelle*, etc., are clearly abnormal, since the typical fractured form survives in the Modern name. *Calde-* must be the spelling of a scribe from another area.

§ 7. The contention advanced in the foregoing paragraphs is that the unfractured forms of Pl.-Ns. in the Essex F.F. may very well represent a genuine type actually in use in a border-area of Essex, on the confines of Suffolk and Cambs.

Whether it is true that, as Mr. Reaney says (*Englische Studien*, 59 (3), p. 345), the Anglian type was the "usual form" in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in London and Middlesex raises

yet another question. I may say that, so far, my investigations have resulted in the discovery of only one genuine unfractured Pl.-N. form (of 1252), in the very numerous forms which I have collected of Pl.-Ns. belonging to London and Middlesex, before c. 1290. Forms like *Aldermanesbury* (1190 Cat. Anc. Dds.), etc., are no proof of the early existence of the non-fracture type in London; *ealdor-monn-* becomes L.O.E. *ældormonn-* (without lengthening before *-ld*, in the first syllable of a three-syllabled word), and in E.M.E. *aldermon-*, with typical Essex-City retraction of *ǣ* to *ǣ̆*.

§ 8. If this evidence is reliable, Mr. Reaney must apparently look elsewhere than to *-ald-* spellings in order to establish "London influence" on the early spellings of Essex Pl.-Ns. in the F.F. I have recently had occasion to examine a very large number of early Essex documents containing local Pl.-Ns., and my strong impression is that the spellings of the latter reflect, faithfully and consistently, the dialect features of Essex, which are distinctive and unmistakable. Not the least persistent and characteristic of these, and one which Essex has in common with the early dialect both of the City and of Middlesex, is the occurrence of fracture in *ēld*, "old," etc. Thus the thirteenth-century *-ald-* spellings in Essex Pl.-Ns., even if they were common (which, I submit, they are not) could not reflect "London" forms, since *-ald-* is, if anything, even rarer at this period in documents written in London than in those belonging to Essex.

BARBARA A. MACKENZIE.

Somerville College, Oxford,
May, 1927.

A SEMANTIC NOTE ON "ANGLO-SAXON"

ELSEWHERE * I have published several notes in which I cite a number of examples of the use of the term *Anglo-Saxon* in the meaning "modern English speech." I have now another instance of this use to record. Mr. J. Walter McSpadden, in his *Stories of Robin Hood and his Merry Outlaws*,† writes as follows (Introduction, p. ix):

* In *American Speech*, vols. i. and ii.

† Published by George C. Harrap & Co., London, 1909.

Songs and legends of Robin Hood and his merry outlaws have charmed readers young and old for more than five hundred years. They are among the earliest heirlooms of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, dating back to the time when Chaucer wrote his "Canterbury Tales," and the minstrel and the scribe stood in the place of the more prim and precise modern printing-press.

If one may judge by this passage, Mr. McSpadden thinks of Chaucer and his contemporaries as writing and speaking Anglo-Saxon in a very early form of that tongue. In other words, to him *Anglo-Saxon* means "modern English." The usage seems to me legitimate; certainly it is natural, for if we speak of the Anglo-Saxon race and Anglo-Saxon civilization of to-day, it is an easy step to give the name *Anglo-Saxon* to the language which goes with that race and civilization. But whether the lexicographers approve or not, the fact remains that *Anglo-Saxon* is not infrequently used in the sense "modern English." The usage is distinctly popular. It is to be contrasted with the learned or technical use of the term in the sense "medieval English," or, latterly, "English before the Conquest."

KEMP MALONE.

THE CASTLE OF INDOLENCE

THE acquisition of a copy of the first edition (4°, 1748) in its original condition enables me to state, though not to solve, a small bibliographical problem, the solution of which might be of wider interest.

The poem was issued in quarto, consisting of B-L in fours (pp. [1]-80), preceded by the title-leaf, followed by an unsigned leaf containing p. 81 (stanzas 80-81 of the second canto), and sometimes preceded, sometimes followed, by a leaf containing the *Advertisement* and the *Explanation of the obsolete Words*.

My uncut and unbound copy makes it clear that the title and the advertisement, etc., are a half-sheet. The concluding leaf of the text forms a half-sheet with B 1, the first leaf of the text. This pair of leaves is folded round the text. It follows, of course, that B 1 is a cancel. In this copy the original B 1 has been cut clean away—the sheets are "stabbed," so that a stub was not wanted (till they came to be bound). But in other copies a stub appears.

R. W. C.

REVIEWS

The Players' Shakespeare : The Tragedie of King Lear.

Newly Printed from the First Folio of 1623. London : Ernest Benn, Ltd. 1927. Pp. xcix + 109 (illustrated). £4 4s. net.

MR. GRANVILLE-BARKER'S Preface to *King Lear*, the most recent play issued in this superb edition, seems to me the most important study in a series of studies, all of them, on many grounds, of importance. In treating *King Lear* as a tragedy written for the stage, and demanding throughout the interpretation the actor can give, Mr. Granville-Barker is answering a challenge, and in so doing has chosen as point of attack a position which, while it is the most difficult to occupy, insures, if it be successfully maintained, decisive victory. Charles Lamb, as every one remembers, selected *King Lear* for special emphasis in illustration of his paradoxical thesis that, whether in tragedy or comedy, "the characters of Shakespeare are incompatible with stage-representation." Dr. A. C. Bradley has similarly maintained that *King Lear* in its vast and complex delineation of passion is too great for the theatre. To the refutation of Lamb's doctrine and of Dr. Bradley's more qualified contention, Mr. Granville-Barker devotes the first section of his Preface, and, as I think, makes out his case with conspicuous, and even triumphant, success.

Against Lamb's thesis—a piece of extravagance, prompted, not unnaturally, by disgust at the absurd adulation of popular actors ; the fulsome flattery that would raise the interpreter to a throne almost equal with that of the creator—Mr. Granville-Barker contends that if Lamb "will not have Shakespeare's *Lear* in the theatre, it is from nothing like Shakespeare's theatre that he bans it" ; and that if Lamb "saw an old man tottering about the stage with a walking stick, he did not see the *Lear* of Shakespeare's intention." He quotes the lines beginning :

Blow windes, & crack your cheeks . . .

adding that any actor who should try to speak the lines "realistically in the character of a feeble old man, would be a fool." Then in contrast to, and in justification of, this downright verdict, there follows a passage of extreme subtlety and insight, unfortunately too long to quote, but ending with a memorable piece of criticism, in which the writer shows how Shakespeare "gains the effect he needs" by a change in the music of the words of the great speech, "by the quick shift from magniloquence to a verse of perfect simplicity.

[A poor, infirme, weake and despis'd old man]

There, by virtue of that effect, stands the man Lear revealed to us again; pathetic by contrast with these elements, yet still terribly great by his identity with our sense of them." To enable an audience to receive this revelation, Mr. Granville-Barker holds, "is not such a hard thing for the actor to do" if he speaks the lines "for their own sake," that is to say, if he is content to become, for the moment, merely a mouthpiece of the magic of Shakespeare's verse.

In reply to Dr. Bradley's contention that *King Lear*, by its "immense scope . . . refuses to reveal itself" in the theatre, Mr. Granville-Barker has a remark which is, to me at least, both striking and novel: that such criticism as Bradley's "involves a fallacy about the theatre generally; . . . that any sort of play, when acted, ought, in a single performance, to leave a clear, complete and final effect upon the spectator." "But this," he observes, "is surely not so. We need no more expect to receive—lapses of performance and attention apart—the full value of a great drama at a first hearing than we expect it of a complex piece of music."

But, indeed, if we accept Lamb's thesis that the plays of Shakespeare are unsuitable for the stage, we are driven to the conclusion, that, if Shakespeare intended them to stand the test of the stage, and they cannot stand it, Shakespeare did not know his job; or, if he was indifferent to the mundane theatre and, in Mr. Granville-Barker's phrase, "wrote his dramas for some theatre laid up for him in Heaven," he was a dishonest workman; and this is but a hard conclusion, from which, if we accept Mr. Granville-Barker's guidance—and in such a matter he is a very safe guide—we may comfortably escape. Following his analysis of the structure of the play, the action and the characters, we shall probably, while realising, as he does, that in Shakespeare's great tragedies there is

"a vision of things to which the action is but a foreground," nevertheless concur in the judgment that, so far from *King Lear* being a tragedy which "cannot be acted . . . the whole scheme and method of its writing is a contrivance for effective acting," and so find what we might expect to find, that in Shakespeare's greatest drama there is also manifested his greatest stagecraft.

In this Preface, as in previous prefaces, the lesson is enforced upon us, rather by what is constantly implied and by the final impression left than by direct doctrine, that an appreciation of the stagecraft is essential to a right understanding of Shakespearian drama. This means that if we are to arrive at ultimate values in regard to any of Shakespeare's plays we must bear constantly in mind the intention with which it was conceived and the medium chosen to give the intention life. 'The Prefaces to the Players' Shakespeare form perhaps the first systematic attempt to treat the plays on that basis, and it is therefore matter for congratulation that the task should be entrusted to the first scholar fully qualified for it; one who can meet the academic and purely literary critics on their own ground (for he also is of their company), and who, at the same time, by reason of special experience gained as player, producer, and playwright, enters on the inquiry with advantages such as no academic or purely literary critic can boast.

A due emphasis laid on the stagecraft does not, of course, imply that other modes of critical approach, even the most pedestrian, can safely be neglected. Still less is it suggested that the needs which the theatre can supply may be satisfied at any West End revival. What Mr. Granville-Barker has before him is, not indeed a perfect theatre laid up for him in Heaven, but the presentation of Shakespeare under stage conditions which might be, but probably never have been, realised on the modern picture-stage.* The theatre of Shakespeare in all its external features can never, except by way of antiquarian experiment, be restored; but the essentials perhaps may be brought back; for the universal appeal of Shakespeare, even in the theatre, can hardly depend on the use of a platform instead of a picture-stage, or on the absence of a front curtain, or on the adoption of one kind of conventional background, rather than of another. It should, however, be possible to establish

* For Mr. Granville-Barker's conception of an ideal theatre which might be realised see his extraordinarily suggestive work *The Exemplary Theatre* (London, 1922).

certain definite principles determining the presentation and essential appeal of a play of Shakespeare in place of the prevalent anarchy under which every producer, and almost every player, is a law unto himself. The nature of this appeal may be described as threefold, with the reservation that the component factors or interests are interdependent and overlap. There is first the interest arising from construction, which includes story, plot, and situation, and not least, continuity of action, with the necessary pauses marking the stages in the progress of the action (the interacts) rightly placed. Secondly, the interest belonging to character, not the interest in intellectual analysis (that comes afterwards, when we review impressions received from an actual or imagined representation), but rather the emotional appeal to pity, awe, admiration, and all the varying kinds and degrees of liking and disliking, sympathy and the reverse. Thirdly, the appeal of language, which, in the dramas of a supreme poet is obviously of the very first importance, and must be preserved unimpaired; neither slurred or mutilated by the pitiful ambition of an actor eager to make points or create an effect, nor weakened by the intrusion of, or by an undue emphasis imparted to, any merely secondary appeal, such as that of scenery, spectacle or music.

That the several parts which constitute the total appeal are throughout interdependent requires little demonstration. That construction and character are inseparable rests on the principle that, in drama, the impression of character is that of character revealed in action. Further, in poetic drama the impression of character can be fully received by the spectator only when the actor rightly appreciates and faithfully renders the essential movement of the verse.

Now, if these three factors or interests—character, construction, and language—constitute the final appeal of Shakespeare, it is needless to assume that the dramas of Shakespeare can be rightly played only in a theatre specially designed for the purpose, or that, in order to insure the intimate contact between player and spectator which, as Mr. Granville-Barker rightly insists, is necessary for the maintenance of dramatic illusion in Shakespeare, the player must, as on the platform stage, have some of the audience some of the time to right and left of him, instead of having them all, as with a picture stage, all the time in front. On the other hand, the acceptance of the principle provides a guiding rule, and a very simple one, which is applicable to any kind of stage. Anything attempted on the stage

in the production of a Shakespeare play which is not calculated to strengthen the threefold appeal, but tends rather to obstruct or weaken its force, is illegitimate and to be avoided. If, for example, the impression of continuity be broken by a faulty distribution of the interacts, or by the too frequent dropping of the curtain to meet the requirements of elaborate staging; if the impression of character be enfeebled by excessive attention to scenic background; or if the power and beauty of the spoken word be lessened or lost by the intrusion of the player's personality, or by the distraction of purely spectacular effect, then the essential is subordinated to the secondary, and the aim and intention of Shakespeare frustrated. It is a very simple rule, but in almost any West End revival one sees it frequently ignored or defied.

By Mr. Granville-Barker the rule is never lost sight of. It is not his way to formulate precise principles, but the whole Preface to this edition of *King Lear* may be regarded, in one aspect at least, as an expression of the significance and the application of the rule. After the introductory section in which he defends, against Lamb and Bradley, the tragedy of *King Lear* as eminently suitable and indeed throughout conceived for representation on the stage, he passes to a full consideration, first of the main lines of the play's construction, secondly, of the method of the dialogue, thirdly, of the characters and their interplay, subordinate interests such as staging, costume, and music being briefly treated at the close. The exposition, under each head and throughout, is, I will not say brilliant—brilliance was to be expected, and is there—but masterly and, with small qualification, convincing. Not that this study supersedes other critical studies, such as that of Dr. Bradley; rather—and that not merely by reason of the special treatment and approach—it supplements and at points provides a corrective to Bradley, as Bradley in turn supplies a corrective to Granville-Barker. It is to be hoped, therefore, that ere long this Preface and the other Prefaces will be made accessible to the student in a single volume. Unfortunately the conditions of the modern theatre preclude the hope that Mr. Granville-Barker may one day provide ocular and aural demonstration of the validity of the principles towards which he is working, by producing *King Lear* as it should be produced, with the essential appeal dominant and undisturbed, and with every other legitimate appeal duly subordinate. Meantime the present unique contribution to Shakespeare criticism will enable the reader

to imagine how greatly such a production of the play would help towards a full realisation of its power, beauty, and profound significance. Consider merely such a passage as this :

"[Shakespeare] has kept a technical master-stroke for his ending.

Enter Lear with Cordelia in his arms.

There should be a long, still pause, while Lear passes slowly in with his burden, while they all stand, respectful as of old to his majesty. We may have wondered a little that Shakespeare should be content to let Cordelia pass from the play as casually as she seems to in the earlier scene. But this is the last of her, not that. Dumb and dead, she that was never apt of speech—what fitter finish for her could there be ? What fitter ending to the history of the two of them, which began for us, with Lear on his throne, conscious of all eyes on him, while she shamed and angered him by her silence ? The same company are here, or all but the same, and they await his pleasure. Even Regan and Goneril are here to pay him ghastly homage. But he knows none of them—save for a brief moment Kent whom he banished—none but Cordelia, and again he reproaches her silence ; for

Her voice was ever soft

Gentle and low, an excellent thing in woman.

Then his heart breaks."

This passage—and there are many others not less beautiful—strikes me as almost beyond praise, and there is little in the Preface that calls for anything but praise. Let me, however, take what there is.

Mr. Granville-Barker prefers the Folio text to that of the Pide Bull Quarto, and rightly so, for the former is vastly superior in almost every way.* He is evidently inclined to think that it represents "Shakespeare's own second thoughts," and is the version finally approved by the poet as most effective for purposes of the stage. Accordingly he recommends the producer "to found himself on the Folio," but at the same time advises some admixture of exclusively Quarto matter. Would it not be safer for the producer to abide by the Folio with complete fidelity ? Whether it be or be not Shakespeare's final choice, it is the version finally accepted by Shakespeare's theatre, and the "cuts" were probably made for some good reason, and are in some degree authoritative.†

* To mention one important point, it is far better punctuated. The Folio punctuation is certainly no printer's achievement, but seems clearly intended by the poet to guide the player to a right delivery of the language.

† In regard to the arraignment of Goneril (III. vi.) omitted in the Folio Mr. Granville-Barker says, "One can only suppose that in acting it had proved ineffective. One cannot imagine Shakespeare regretting he had written it" (*Preface*, lxxxiii).

In the section of the Preface which treats of the construction, Mr. Granville-Barker is a little more inclined than he was in some of the earlier Prefaces to pay respect to the Act-Division of the Folio. Still, even when granting a dramatic validity to the five-part plan, he definitely recommends at one point a departure from the Folio arrangement; and this on grounds which seem to me inadequate. Here again, if the producer wishes to be on the safe side, he will stick to the Folio text, which, on the lowest estimate, possesses a certain authority, while it may have the very highest. No other scheme of division can claim any authority, while the practice of the modern stage, adopted in comparatively recent years and in defiance of long tradition, is, whenever I have tested it, on every principle that has reference to the structure of Shakespeare's plays, always without significance and frequently demonstrably wrong. In *Lear* Mr. Granville-Barker, accepting the five-part plan as an alternative to the scheme of division which he prefers, would place the first interact, not with the Folio, after the fifth scene of the play, but after the second. The first two scenes, he holds, form a sort of double dramatic prologue, since they provide "a full and almost formal statement of the play's main theme, with a show of the characters that are to develop it," and since, after the second scene, "follows the only clearly indicated time-division in the play." To this view, it may be objected, first, that the situation is not really complete, and the development of the tragic action not thoroughly prepared for until we have seen the dethroned king in open conflict with his supplanters. Moreover, the show of characters who develop the action is not fully made up until we have seen those two who are to be Lear's inseparable companions during the whole course of the tragic conflict—the Fool and Kent disguised as serving-man. Secondly, it may be urged that the indication of time-division is apparent only as the result of later critical analysis, when the reader is able to compare carefully words spoken at the beginning of the second scene—a long one—with the situation revealed by the dialogue of the short third scene. No such impression is received by the spectator while the action is in progress.

Mr. Granville-Barker, however, attaches no special importance to the indication of time-division. He favours a two-part scheme, with one definite interval only, namely at the end of Act III. Against such division there is, besides the fact that (as I believe) it disregards the plan on which all Shakespearian plays are constructed, the

insuperable objection that it imposes on the receptive faculties of the playgoer, anxious to miss nothing that producer and players have to offer him, far too great a strain. I venture to think that Mr. Granville-Barker is too exclusively concerned with producers and players. He seems apt to forget the poor playgoer who, unlike the actor, even the actor cast for the heaviest part, has to concentrate attention all the time. Again Mr. Granville-Barker appears to conceive of an interval as implying an interval long enough to allow the audience to disperse. This is surely unnecessary. A very few minutes will generally suffice as breathing space and to indicate a stage in the progress of the action. Even if it be desirable to have at one point a longer break, Shakespeare has provided for it in all his tragedies exactly where Mr. Granville-Barker would place it in *King Lear*, namely before the change of dramatic motive which invariably characterises a Shakespearian fourth act.

In the course of his study Mr. Granville-Barker has two remarks which I could wish away. There are only two such, and being incidental they do not affect the truth and justice of the study as a whole. "The main tragic note in the world," he says, "to the Shakespeare who wrote *King Lear*, is that Fate could be blindly cruel," and, immediately before this, he speaks of Shakespeare's mind when he wrote this tragedy as "working to the tune of . . .

As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods ;
They kill us for their sport."

That fate may be cruel is a truth not shirked in Shakespearian tragedy, but it was not to Shakespeare at any time the final truth (Bradley in such a question is a safer guide) ; and if when he wrote *King Lear* Shakespeare had indeed believed that the nature of the higher powers was that assigned to Setebos by Browning's Caliban, he would scarcely have put the confession of his faith into the mouth of so poor a creature as Gloster, while he leaves to the sane and balanced Edgar the confident belief that "the gods are just," and to Lear himself, even at the moment of failure, gives words which seem to sum up the message of tragic reconciliation,

Upon such sacrifices, my Cordelia,
The gods themselves throw incense.

The notion that, during his tragic period, an unrelieved gloom pervades Shakespeare's conception of life is traceable, perhaps, partly to the convention of the modern theatre which has almost forgotten

tragedy as Shakespeare conceived it, to decline on plays merely unpleasant ; partly to the acceptance of critical values made current by scholars to whom criticism in other respects owes much, but who, in their endeavour to trace the development of Shakespeare's mind, have endowed him, according to somewhat arbitrarily bounded periods, with several distinct minds and wholly divergent mental attitudes towards human life and the powers which control it. I believe this view to be fundamentally mistaken. Shakespeare at no time, either when he wrote *Romeo and Juliet* or when he wrote *King Lear*, regarded human beings as merely impotent and irresponsible victims of a blindly cruel Fate, and, no rebel against earthly authority, he never arraigned the high gods. At many moments, when we seem to hear the poet's own voice in the utterances of his creatures, there is at least an implied appeal to the court of heaven as a tribunal whence justice may be sought, and will inevitably in the long run be found. It is by no concession to conventional piety that Horatio prays that flights of angels may sing Hamlet to his rest, or that Macbeth, recoiling from contemplated murder, declares that Duncan's virtues—

Will plead like angels trumpet-tongued against
The deep damnation of his taking off.

A feature in the *Players' Shakespeare* are the illustrations, in the present volume placed after the text. Mr. Paul Nash's drawings may have a value and meaning for those who understand his precious and aggressively unconventional art. They have, however, no relation to Mr. Granville-Barker's commentary ; they can scarcely be of service to the producer, and they are not helpful towards an appreciation of the play. Some of them indeed scarcely pretend to illustrate the text but merely the interpolated scene-headings of eighteenth and nineteenth century editors. Thus the first drawing entitled " Act II. Scene 3, A Wood " (the explanatory description is not superfluous) is placed against Edgar's speech beginning " I heard myself proclaim'd." There is no such scene in the Folio, and there is no cleared stage before or after the lines of which the editors make a scene. An Editor (Staunton) imagined a wood from a mention in the speech of a single tree (elsewhere), and in defiance of the text, from which, at the end of the true scene, we learn that

for many Miles about
There's scarce a bush.

Whether Shakespeare has suffered most from editors or producers is a debatable question. Mr. Nash's curious drawing reminds us of some of the fantastic tricks played by editors. Mr. Granville-Barker's noble study enables us to imagine the service to Shakespeare which the right producer may some day render.

MARK HUNTER.

Gulliver's Travels. By JONATHAN SWIFT, D.D. The Text of the First Edition edited, with an Introduction, Bibliography and Notes, by HAROLD WILLIAMS. The First Edition Club, 1926. Pp. cii+490. (Illustrated). £2 2s. net.

THIS new edition of *Gulliver's Travels*, printed in a Baskerville type at the Oxford University Press, will appeal alike to the general reader, the student of eighteenth-century literature, and the book-collector. The general reader will find reproduced the text of Swift's masterpiece in an attractively bound single volume, illustrated by twelve facsimiles of general and separate title-pages and maps from the first edition. These are placed through the volume as they were originally. The frontispiece reproduces the portrait of Captain Lemuel Gulliver in its rare first state. An absolute reproduction of the dislocations of type, or other typographical blemishes, is not undertaken; but nevertheless the text of the original edition is given as nearly as possible, even to the extent of reproducing the varied use of italic and roman type, the punctuation, capitalisation, and spelling irregularities of the first printing—all most carefully done. The notes to each of the four parts are comprehensive, Swift's many references to the politics and the Court intrigue of the time being just sufficiently explained to make clear the allegory and the satire.

In the editor's introduction, which occupies, approximately, the first seventy pages of the volume, is discussed for the student of literature, the early history of the writing and the printing of this world-book. Here he will find interesting comments on Swift's none-too-amicable relations with his publisher, Benjamin Motte; and he may trace the subsequent fortunes of the book as it was issued at Motte's hands and by later publishers.

Until the appearance of Mr. Williams's volume it had generally

been supposed that *Gulliver's Travels*, completed in something like its present shape in 1720, was written at intervals and slowly, as so many of Swift's works were, its composition occupying Swift's leisure hours. Mr. Williams, by a minute analysis of the text and the events of the time, and by the evidence of three hitherto unpublished letters of Swift, to his friend, Charles Ford, shows that nothing like a first draft of *Gulliver's Travels* could have been in existence as early as 1720, the whole work being "clearly not of one piece." The general character of the satire in the first two parts is governed chiefly by events subsequent to 1720. In contrast, the last two voyages contain but little reference to contemporary history, the satire directed not to events and persons, but to institutions and society.

Swift's relations with Faulkner, the publisher of five Dublin editions, are also presented. As may be seen from the evidence Mr. Williams offers, Faulkner was an exception to the usual pirate Dublin printer, Swift referring to him as "the prince of Dublin printers." The Faulkner text of 1735 is analysed minutely. In estimating its importance, Mr. Williams reaches the conclusion that this Faulkner edition may claim not only the active interest of Swift himself, but that the Dean's co-operation went further, even to the extent of glancing over the sheets as they went to press. The textual evidence from this edition "virtually confirms the conclusion that Swift's share in the publication was much more than passive."

Finally, for the bibliographer and book-collector, Mr. Williams's edition has a definite appeal. Following the editor's critical introduction, may be found full collations of the Motte editions, and other important early printings, all admirably compact. The intricate problem of the sequence of the Motte octavo and duodecimo editions is capably analysed.

In 1726 Motte published three octavo editions, hitherto commonly described as variant issues of the first edition. Similarly, as on the publication of *Robinson Crusoe*, the demand for the book was greater than the printer expected, with the result that more than one printing-house was called upon to do the work.

The editor discusses the bibliographical terms—*edition*, *issue*, *impression*—and reaches the obvious conclusion that there is no justification for describing as issues of one edition books set up anew and printed from different type. The case of two separate printings

of a book, both bearing the same edition designation on the title-page, yet each differing from the other in manifold small ways, such as in the use of capitals and in lineation, does not occur with printings of *Gulliver's Travels*. Even though Motte's printing of 1727, in two volumes, describes the publication as "the Second Edition," the editor is correct in referring to the separate earlier printings of the previous year as *editions* or *printings*.

To indicate the sequence of these publications of Motte, his octavos and first duodecimo editions,* I prefer the word *printing* to the word *edition*. Motte himself, as Mr. Williams points out, might not have considered his three 1726 printings as separate issues of the same edition. Witness, for example, the title-page of Volume II. of his second 1726 printing, which contains the words, "The Second Edition." If the word *edition* is used, is not confusion likely to arise over the fact that the general title-page to Volume I. of the 1727 octavo printing, already referred to, is similarly described by Motte "The Second Edition"? Further, the second volume of this 1727 printing is described on its title-page as "The Second Edition, Corrected," the addition of the "corrected" justified, according to the editor, by the incorporation here for the first time of the Ford corrections.†

From this it will be at once apparent that irregular combinations of volumes are not infrequent, the most usual one being Volume I. of the 1726 continuously paged edition and Volume II., "The Second Edition, Corrected," of 1727. I have seen, however, a copy of the third printing of Volume I., the continuously paged edition, with a copy of Volume II., "The Second Edition" on its title-page, both dated 1726, bound together in contemporary calf. To describe this single volume, for example, would not the word *printing* be better than *edition*? Further, if the book-collector wants a copy of Motte's second edition of *Gulliver's Travels*, what edition should he buy? If he wants Motte's second *printing*, he must buy a copy with the portrait in its second state, with Part III. ending on p. 154, not on p. 155, as in the first printing, and with each part separately paged.

In the section of Mr. Williams's volume entitled *Collations and*

* Motte's duodecimo edition of 1727 is a cheap and more popular edition, included in Mr. Williams's enumeration as it is textually related to the octavo editions, being set from a copy of the continuously paged octavo, the printing just preceding it in point of time.

† See Appendix I. of Mr. Williams's volume.

Notes, the many editions from 1726 through 1751 are collated completely, with succinct notes in which are listed the interesting peculiarities and distinctive points of certain editions, which book-collectors are always looking for, together with the location of copies. It would have been helpful if Mr. Williams had indicated some of the many bibliographical references where copies of the various 1726 and 1727 printings of *Gulliver* are described, for example, such admirable catalogues as *The Hoe Catalogue* (III. 127), *The Huth Catalogue* (IV. 1420), *Bibliotheca Grenvilliana* (II. 704), *The Church Catalogue* (II. 1031-2), and *The Ashley Library Catalogue* (VI. 28-30),* but lack of space probably prevented this.†

There is in the Yale University Library a Dublin Edition of 1727, evidently not recorded by Mr. Williams. The copy I refer to, two volumes in one, is continuously paged, Volume I. having 14 unnumbered pages, 133 numbered pages, with page 134 blank; while Volume II. has pages 135, 136, and 137 unnumbered, and pages 138-283 numbered. The verso of page 283 contains a list of "Books printed for, and sold by George Risk." An engraving of Jonathan Swift by T. Cook, "engraved after an original picture in the collection of the late Lord Chesterfield," mounted, faces the title-page of Volume I. The only maps are two double maps, the first one marked "Plate I, Part I, Page I," to be found in front of p. 1, Volume I.; the second, marked "Plate II, Part II, Page I," bound between pp. 64 and 65.

These two maps, as may be seen from the inscriptions, are identical with those in the London 1726 Motte edition, except that the margins have been cut close to the rule border, and the maps folded. There are no other cuts or maps in the book except a small woodcut of a harbour at the top of the pages beginning Parts I. and III., a fanciful woodcut of Venus at the top of the page beginning Part II., and a decorative woodcut at the top of the page beginning Part IV. The curious and common error appearing in all the Motte editions, and in Risk's other Dublin edition of 1727, as noted by Mr. Williams, that of the seventh chapter of Part III. being

* Mr. Williams refers to W. Spencer Jackson, *Bibliography of the Writings of Jonathan Swift* (in vol. xii., 1908, of *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, edited by Temple Scott), and makes a special acknowledgment of his debt to Dr. Lucius Lee Hubbard, *Contributions towards a Bibliography of Gulliver's Travels* (1922).

† Mr. Williams has indicated the recto and the verso of leaves by the conventional "a" and "b"; for example, "A1a general title, A1b blank," though the more accepted method, unless one uses "verso" and "recto," is "A1" and "A1r."

numbered "Chap. V.," does not appear in this printing. For the details just given, and for the transcript of the titles following, I am indebted to Miss A. S. Pratt of the Yale University Library.

TRAVELS/ INTO SEVERAL/ Remote Nations/ OF THE/ WORLD./ VOL. I.*/ CONTAINING/ PART I. A Voyage to LILLIPUT./ Part II. A Voyage to BROBDINGNAG./ By LEMUEL GULLIVER,/ First a Surgeon, and then a Captain of several SHIPS./ With CUTS and MAPS of the Author's Travels./ DUBLIN:/ Printed by S. P. for G. RISK, G. EWING,/ and W. SMITH, in Dame's-street,/ MDCCXXVII./

TRAVELS/ INTO SEVERAL/ REMOTE NATIONS/ OF THE/ WORLD./ VOL. II./ CONTAINING/ PART III. A Voyage to LAPUTA, BALNI-/ BARBI, LUGGNAGG, GLUBDUBDRIB and/ JAPAN./ PART IV. A Voyage to the Country of the/ HOUYHNHNMS./ By LEMUEL GULLIVER,/ First a Surgeon, and then a Captain of several SHIPS./ With CUTS and MAPS of the Author's Travels./ DUBLIN:/ Printed by S. P. for G. RISK, G. EWING,/ and W. SMITH in Dame's-street,/ MDCCXXVII./

This Risk publication was undoubtedly a piracy, a similar one to that of J. Hyde, also of Dame's Street, in the previous year, occasioned, too, by the popularity of Gulliver. Another letter of Swift to his friend, Charles Ford, shows that by the first quarter of the eighteenth century, London publishers were calloused to the inroads of literary pirates. This letter, dated from Dublin, October 9, 1733, is addressed "To Charles Ford, Esqre. To be left at the Coco-tree in Pell-Mell, London," shows how the author of *Gulliver's Travels* was affected, and bears added testimony to his goodwill toward Faulkner.†

"A Printer of this Town applyed himself to me by letter and friends for leave to print in four volumes the Works of J. S. D. D. . . . I answered that as I could not hinder him, so I would not encourage. . . . There is no Propriety of Copyes here; they print what they please. The man behaved himself with all respect, and since it was an evil I could not avoyd, I had rather They should be printed correctly than otherwise."

The bibliographical material discussed so ably by Mr. Williams may be brought down to date with the mention of the discovery

* "VOL. I." is in MS. on a slip of paper inlaid. It seems probable from a MS. note on the title-page that the original reading was "TWO VOLS. IN ONE."

† See G. P. Winship, *The Ways of Authorship: An Introduction to an Exhibition of Literary Manuscripts belonging to Resident Members of the Club of Odd Volumes and shown at its Club House*, Number Fifty Mount Vernon Street, Boston, April 25 to 30, 1927. See also George Birkbeck Hill, *Unpublished Letters of Dean Swift* (London, 1899), p. 295, and F. Elrington Ball, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift* (1727-1733) (London, 1913), iv. p. 444, where the letter referred to is erroneously headed June 29, 1733. Only a fragment of this letter is given in Ball. I am indebted to Mr. Winship, of the Harvard University Library, for permission to quote from the original letter.

of a copy of the Second Volume of the First Edition of *Gulliver's Travels*, interleaved in parts and annotated, in all probability the copy used by Faulkner for his Dublin edition of 1735.*

On its title-page may be found, written in a contemporary hand, perhaps the writing of Swift himself: "With the Authors own Amendments." The corrections are very similar to those in Ford's copy now in the Forster Collection at South Kensington, a complete list of the latter being contained in Appendix II. of Mr. Williams's volume.† A misplaced paragraph is of especial interest, a paragraph which was printed for the first time in Faulkner's edition, at the end of Chapter 6 of Part IV. The typesetter overlooked the instructions written above it: "Vid. Part. 2^d Page 110. line 12th," which refer, of course, to the first edition; and could easily have done so, for the note is in a different ink, red, and lighter than the passage added, and much faded. Reference to the context shows that the paragraph: "Without the consent of this Illustrious Body, no Law can be made, repealed or altered, and these have the Decisions of all our Possessions without Appeal," makes no sense in the place where it was printed by Faulkner, the text, which deals with the nobility, and describes "our young Noblemen," reading [Faulkner's Edition (1735), 332-3]:

"That, a weak diseased Body, a meager Countenance, and sallow Complexion, are the true Marks of *Noble Blood*; and a healthy robust Appearance is so disgraceful in a Man of Quality, that the World concludes his real Father to have been a Groom or a Coachman. The Imperfections of his Mind run parallel with those of his Body; being a composition of Spleen, Dulness, Ignorance, Caprice, Sensuality and Pride." And then follows: "Without the consent of this Illustrious Body," etc.

This passage obviously belongs, as the emendation indicates, with the description of the Houses of Parliament, in *Gulliver's* journey to the land of the Brobdingnagians:

"That, the other part of the Parliament consisted of an Assembly called the House of Commons, who were all principal Gentlemen, *freely* picked and culled out by the People themselves, for their great Abilities, and Love of their Country, to represent the Wisdom of the whole Nation. And, these two Bodies make up the most august Assembly in *Europe*, to whom, in conjunction with the Prince, the whole Legislature is committed." *Without the consent of this Illustrious Body, no Law can be made, etc.*

* Through the courtesy of Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., in whose hands the volume is at present, it has been my privilege to examine the copy.

† See *The Literary Supplement of the London Times* for June 30 and July 28, 1927, pp. 460 and 520, respectively.

The sense is perfect. It should be noted, in passing, that the place in the text on p. 110, at l. 12, comes at the end of a paragraph, the next paragraph beginning: "I then descended to the Courts of Justice," etc.

This newly discovered copy also records many other changes which do not appear in the Faulkner edition of 1735. For example, on p. 114, Part IV., the First Edition (ll. 3-5) reads: "To this I was silent out of Partiality to my own Kind; yet here I could discover the true Seeds of *Spleen*. . . ." A broken line is drawn around *could*, the word *plainly* written at the margin to the left, and a caret inserts *ed* after (and above) *discover*. The passage appears in Faulkner (p. 342, ll. 32-3) as: ". . . yet here I could plainly discover . . ." which is also a Ford correction. On p. 109 of this Motte edition, also Part IV., appear three alterations, two of them corrected, one not. The uncorrected change is the addition of the words *in them* at l. 2, after *produced* in the passage: ". . . and it produced [in them] the same Effects that Wine hath upon us . . ." One more illustration from Part III. (p. 115, l. 2), not a Ford correction, will suffice to show the nature of these emendations, the line in the first edition reading: "A Youth who had never seen the Sea, the Son of *Libertina*, who waited on one of the Emperor's Mistresses." A marginal correction at the right changes *Libertina* to a *Libertine*, the reading in the Faulkner text (p. 257, ll. 16-18) being: "A Boy who had never seen the Sea, the Son of a *Libertina*. . . ."

The total number of corrections which have not been followed in any printed edition is considerable.

It might be argued that this interleaved copy of the second volume of Motte's first edition was prepared for one of the later editions, say, perhaps, for the Bathurst edition of 1742. Would it be likely, however, that a Motte edition of 1726 would be chosen for this purpose, rather than the Faulkner edition of 1735? The inscription on the title-page already referred to, "With the Authors own Amendments," would indicate alterations contemporary with the Ford corrections. That these changes differ is all the more significant.

It is possible that at some time the companion Volume I. of this Motte interleaved and annotated copy of Volume II. will turn up. As Ford's corrections for the first two parts of *Gulliver's Travels* were not numerous, it may be that this volume, too, would show few

changes. But our knowledge of this second volume is important. It would be interesting to compare the alterations in detail with those of Ford. It may be that Swift had even more to do with the emendation of the text of *Gulliver* than has already been established.

Mr. Williams's edition, then, is an interesting and successful attempt to combine in a single volume the text of the *editio princeps*, the literary history of the composition and publication of *Gulliver's Travels*, with a carefully annotated bibliographical discussion of the early editions.

HENRY CLINTON HUTCHINS.

The Prelude or Growth of a Poet's Mind. By WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. Edited from the Manuscripts with Introduction, Textual and Critical Notes, by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. Pp. lxii+614. 25s. net.

"I CANNOT help regretting," said Coleridge on July 21, 1832,* "that Wordsworth did not first publish his thirteen books on the growth of an individual mind—superior, as I used to think, upon the whole, to the *Excursion*." Posterity has endorsed the criticism of Coleridge, and to-day all lovers of Wordsworth must gratefully recognise their obligation to Professor de Selincourt for his new edition of *The Prelude*. Here for the first time are presented (on alternate pages), the published text of 1850 and the earlier, hitherto unpublished version of 1805-6 with their variants.

In an admirably lucid and concise introduction, the editor describes the various manuscripts, and examines the chronology, text and content of the poem. He tells us that "there are five almost complete extant MSS. of *The Prelude* covering the years 1805-39, as well as several notebooks and other MSS. which contain drafts of parts of the poem, and belong to an earlier period. The main MSS. fall clearly into two groups, according as they are more closely related to the first complete text or to the authorised version." Here, then, for the first time, the reader is able to discover what textual changes Wordsworth made in his great spiritual autobiography during those thirty-five years of frequent revision. Indeed, if Professor de Selincourt and Professor Garrod are correct in dating the preamble of the poem as early as 1795, the work as a whole bears the imprint of nearly 50 years of the poet's life.

* For July 31 read 21, on p. xxv, note 1, of Professor de Selincourt's Introduction.

The changes which Wordsworth made in his poem during those long and sometimes eventful years, were made for various reasons, religious, philosophical, political, artistic, and therefore these various texts of *The Prelude* are of the very texture of Wordsworth's own life and character. For this reason the labours of Professor de Selincourt do not result in merely verbal discoveries, as he indeed points out.

The Prelude or Growth of a Poet's Mind was the full title with which the poem faced the criticism of the world. It is not strange that Wordsworth forbade its publication during his lifetime, for the frankness displayed in this poem by one of the most reticent of our romantic poets has always surprised the reader, even before the publication of this early text. But as we now see, time, the dimming of his hopes and ideals in and for men, a growing disillusionment, led Wordsworth to make omissions, abbreviations and additions during the years, so that his early, original text makes us wonder at the candour and spontaneity of its self-revelation. Thus, this new edition which allows us for the first time accurately to determine the nature and extent of these changes, gives us a clearer and more complete understanding of Wordsworth's nature and spiritual growth than even he could have originally intended.

"No one would doubt," says Professor de Selincourt, "that the 1850 version is a better composition than the A (1805) text," and he emphasises the fact that a comparison of the various MSS. more fully reveals the conscious artistry of Wordsworth, the critical faculty which enabled him to detect and eliminate weaknesses, long after his original, creative energy had cooled. These changes, dictated by Wordsworth's sense of form, are such that the editor well says: "To study the development of . . . passages from their first conception is a lesson in the craftsmanship of letters."

At times Wordsworth is prosaic, when his subject is too ordinary or too abstract for high poetic form; but when the moment comes, he always shows that mastery of words which springs from an intuitive and intimate sense of their beauty.

Twice five years
Or less I might have seen, when first my mind
With conscious pleasure opened to the charm
Of words in tuneful order, found them sweet
For their own *sakes*, a passion and a power;
And phrases pleased me chosen for delight,
For pomp, or love.

[V. 552-8]

In these lines Wordsworth clearly reveals that elemental delight in the sensuous beauty of language, which he shares with the greatest poets. As he grew older, many other qualities, of an intellectual order, grew and mingled with his early, sensuous delight in Nature and language, but even when the great era of inspiration had passed and his poetic powers waned, from time to time in some sudden moment of revival, this elemental joy in the beauty of language would burst forth again, and his lips became inspired. Thus it was that, when over sixty years of age, he added to his poem the immortal lines on the statue of Newton :

The marble index of a mind for ever
Voyaging through strange seas of Thought alone.

[III. 62-3]

This keen susceptibility to the beauty of language is even more clearly revealed to us, as we follow the changes he made in his text. In the best examples, we see Wordsworth retaining what is most musical, most rhythmic, most expressive. At the same time, in his revisions, he rejects, most frequently with unerring taste, whatever of flatness in sound or sense had crept into his verse, and he adds lines which increase the vividness, the directness, the immediacy of the experience he narrates.

Describing in Book x. his disillusionment with the French Revolution as it passed from one excess to another, he writes in the earlier version :

Most melancholy at that time, O Friend !
Were my day-thoughts, my dreams were miserable ;
Through months, through years, long after the last beat
Of those atrocities (I speak bare truth,
As if to thee alone in private talk)
I scarcely had one night of quiet sleep
Such ghastly visions had I of despair
And tyranny, and implements of death,
And long orations which in dreams I pleaded
Before unjust Tribunals, with a voice
Labouring, a brain confounded, and a sense
Of treachery and desertion in the place
The holiest that I knew of, my own soul.

[II. 369-81]

He had expressed himself with passion and nobility, but the artist in Wordsworth was not satisfied. He had inserted *détours* which broke the continuity of the action and consequently of the emotion. He had not attained in expression to the intensity of his experience, and he had concluded the passage with a line which was weak because,

by reason of form, it led to misplaced emphasis, and apparently wandered from the main theme, just before the climax to which it should lead. So he worked upon it until it took a new form that combined the most poetic of the original with new poetic material equal to it in quality.

Most melancholy at that time, O Friend !
 Were my day-thoughts,—my nights were miserable ;
 Through months, through years, long after the last beat
 Of those atrocities, the hour of sleep
 To me came rarely charged with natural gifts,
 Such ghastly visions had I of despair
 And tyranny, and implements of death ;
 And innocent victims sinking under fear,
 And momentary hope, and worn-out prayer,
 Each in his separate cell, or penned in crowds
 For sacrifice, and struggling with fond mirth
 And levity in dungeons, where the dust
 Was laid with tears. Then suddenly the scene
 Changed, and the unbroken dream entangled me
 In long orations, which I strove to plead
 Before unjust tribunals,—with a voice
 Labouring, a brain confounded, and a sense,
 Death-like, of treacherous desertion, felt
 In the last place of refuge—my own soul.

[ll. 397-415]

Nevertheless all Wordsworth's changes are not improvements, and, as his editor says, the commonest of his errors in this way are due to his strange revival in later years, of that pompous and formal poetic diction of the eighteenth century, which he had in early manhood attacked. More frequently, too, than Professor de Selincourt's introduction suggests, we find fine passages of the earlier version sacrificed in the later one. The earlier rendering,

Wonder not
 If such my transports were ; for in all things now
 I saw one life, and felt that it was joy,

[ll. ll. 428-30]

is on the whole better than that which replaces it in 1850 :

Wonder not,
 If high the transport, great the joy I felt.

[ll. ll. 409-10]

His return to the stilted diction of the eighteenth-century poets leads him to change the lines :

Nor less in springtime when on southern banks
 The shining sun had from his knot of leaves
 Decoy'd the primrose flower, and when the Vales
 And woods were warm, was I a plunderer then

In the high places, on the lonesome peaks
Where'er, among the mountains and the winds,
The Mother Bird had built her lodge,

[I. ll. 333-39]

to :

Nor less when spring had warmed the cultured Vale,
Moved we as plunderers where the mother-bird
Had in high places built her lodge.

[I. ll. 326-8]

The realistic description of the sleeping village in the earlier version (Book iv. 450-3), is omitted from the later text :

At this, I turn'd and looked towards the Village
But all were gone to rest ; the fires all out ;
And every silent window to the Moon
Shone with a yellow glitter.

There is too, in the later version of *The Prelude*, an almost inevitable loss of spontaneity. The conscious art of Wordsworth the reviser is by no means always worth the passion and spontaneity of Wordsworth the young poet. Wordsworth was always honest, but with the passage of the years his beliefs had largely changed. In one sense, it is true, he never changed, for he never ceased to believe that the democratic faith of his earlier years was right in an ideal sense. Experience led him to reject the belief in the perfectibility of man which he had too easily accepted, and with the loss of that belief much of his faith in democratic government, in the realisation in this imperfect world of the brotherhood of man, necessarily went too.

For this reason, his revision of *The Prelude* largely became the revision, in later years amid disillusionment, of the abandoned hopes, enthusiasms and faiths of youth. He tried to be honest and not to leave behind him a false or garbled account of himself during those earlier years, but even he was unable to place before the eyes of the world an unqualified record of what now often seemed to him the generous follies of youth and inexperience. Besides, the earlier version was an intimate confession intended for the sympathetic ear of Coleridge alone. The later was to go out to so much of the world as would read it. It was therefore almost inevitable that much of the spontaneity of the earlier version should disappear from the second, that references to political enthusiasms now discarded should be toned down, that the allusion to Burke in Book vii. should be inserted, and that to Fox removed.

It was almost inevitable, also, that with this growth of the wisdom

of experience, the early poetic vision of the absolute should grow dim. With that decline of faith came timidity, and the judgments which he had made in the light of that early vision seemed too direct, too sweeping, too daring, in his later years. In this Wordsworth presents a complete contrast to Blake, whose mystic faith, strong enough to withstand all the assaults of circumstance, never failed. So Wordsworth modifies in his revisions, not only his revolutionary and democratic enthusiasms, but his earlier contempt for formal methods of education, and his earlier neglect of formal Christianity.

There were other influences contributory to this end. The irresponsibility and social freedom of those earlier years of wandering passed. He could no longer remain apart, detached from his country, loyal only to his deepest intuitions and beliefs. These beliefs and intuitions and the poetic inspiration they created had waned, and it was natural that other and less rare loyalties should take their place. Besides, he had found a place in the social framework of life; he occupied a definite position in the social order. He held indeed an official position as Distributor of Stamps, which no doubt for him entailed moral responsibilities, light as the practical ones may have been, and he had also incurred the duties, responsibilities and influences of marriage. This sense of responsibility became a powerful influence in his later revision of his work, emphasising his general tendency to return to the traditional views and judgments upon the interests of men. In some ways his life was one of narrowing horizons.

If ever a poet saw life mystically, under the terms of the absolute, Wordsworth so saw it. From contemplating life in that perspective he came to regard it almost parochially. But the influence of his years of illumination never left him; indeed, we see even more clearly as a result of the work of Professor de Selincourt, that in the deepest sense, the vision itself remained. However overlaid with doubts, or dimmed by disillusion, it was a permanent, unconscious force inspiring and controlling all his greatest work. And when all has been said as to the changes which time wrought in Wordsworth's life and thought, a comparison of these versions leaves us ultimately surprised, that what was fundamental in him has so endured, that the general quality of his early life and character has so clearly survived the shocks and disillusionments of experience, that the final version of his spiritual biography contains so much of its earliest form.

Professor de Selincourt does not need our thanks, for his labours must have been their own reward; nevertheless all lovers of Wordsworth must be grateful to him for thus illuminating the poet's spiritual pilgrimage, and bringing to us a more intimate knowledge of one on whom

The light of beauty did not fall in vain.

OSWALD DOUGHTY.

Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, First Keeper of the Bodleian Library. Edited with an Introduction by G. W. WHEELER. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. 10 in. Pp. xlviii+251. 21s. net.

THIS is the first accurate, complete, and chronological edition of the correspondence for a dozen years (1601-13) between the founder of the Bodleian and its first librarian. All but two of the letters were printed in *Reliquiæ Bodleianæ* (1703) by Hearne, but in altered spelling and not in their proper order. The whole is now presented in a beautiful form, and will be accepted by librarians as a happy memorial of a great event in the history of libraries, and an extremely interesting account of even the smallest details of bibliothecal economy in the infancy of a famous foundation. Bodley announced his intention of establishing a public library for the university in 1598; the library was actually opened November 8, 1602. Meanwhile, he had appointed Dr. Thomas James as librarian, and was busily engaged amassing books, by purchase or by donation, dispatching them to Oxford by road or by the large barges that plied up the Thames as far as Burcot, and sending James the minutest instructions on the binding, arrangement, and cataloguing of the books, and on a multitude of particulars relating to their safe custody and their future use. Nothing was beneath his notice. He showed intense anxiety about such matters as the most practical method of classification, the proper way of entering authors' names or titles of books in the catalogue, and the shelving of folios and octavos. But, as every librarian knows, these are matters of supreme importance. He was looking after numerous details himself. In the very first letter he writes: "Within this fortnight, I trust, I shall have

ended with my carpenters, joiners, carvers, glasiars, and all that idle rabble; and then I goe in hand, with making up my barres, lockes, haspes, grates, cheines, and other gimmoes of iron, belonging to the fastning and rivetting of the bookes." But he had his eye on the future too. Tireless in soliciting gifts of books, he was careful to encourage further donations by seeing that worthy gifts were worthily acknowledged. At the same time, he warned his librarian against the acceptance of any works that seemed to fall below the standard of seriousness and learning fixed by himself. His contempt for stage plays and other light literature, as is well known, deprived the library of much that would have been afterwards invaluable.

James holds a place of distinction in the roll of historic librarians, as the head of a great line, and as compiler of the first general catalogue of any European library (1605) and of divers other pioneer works of the same kind. He was not, however, quite happy in his position. He had theological ambitions. He was invited to become one of the translators of the Authorised Version, and was always hankering after a church living that would have left him leisure for a work proving that the patristic writings had been deliberately corrupted by partisans of the Roman Catholic Church. He found Bodley a strict taskmaster, but seems to have served him loyally.

E. A. B.

Massinger's "A New Way to Pay Old Debts." Edited by
A. H. CRUICKSHANK. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926.
Pp. xxxiv+141. 6s. net.

PROFESSOR CRUICKSHANK'S enthusiasm for Massinger knows no bounds. A few years ago he presented us with the first authoritative study of Massinger's life and work, and now he has produced what will perhaps remain for a long time the standard edition of *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*. The tendency of an editor, especially of an Elizabethan play, is to write more as an advocate than as a critic, but Professor Cruickshank's judgment seldom betrays him into a false exaltation of Massinger's work. There are, however, two statements in his Introduction that, I think, need revision. Few will agree that the obscenities of Hircius and Spungius in *The*

Virgin Martyr, which are generally attributed to Dekker, "are mainly responsible for the accusation of coarseness which has been unfairly brought against Massinger." Fortunately, posterity is not so unjust in these matters, and Massinger has much to atone for in the lewdness of behaviour and prurient utterances of some of his female characters. Again, in discussing the character of Sir Giles Overreach, Professor Cruickshank writes: "First of all, he is a man of ability, a self-made man who has attained to wealth and power by trampling on other men all his life, and not least by trampling on 'true gentry.'" Wherein does Sir Giles manifest ability? Whether he can be rightly termed "a self-made man" is also extremely doubtful. To the last, he is a scheming and unrepentant villain, whose very villainy is unsuccessful, since he is finally outwitted in all his cherished hopes and is carried away to Bedlam.

All that need be said about the text is that it is a careful reprint of the Quarto, and that the Editor only departs from the original when warranted by a misspelling or defective punctuation. The notes are concise and complete, except that one would have liked an explanation of the allusions to "the Hangman of Vllushing" (iv. i. 53; cf. *The City Madam*, v. iii. 10) and "To take in Dunkerke" (v. i. 233). The numerous parallels cited in the notes illustrate Massinger's trick of repeating himself, and the extent and value of his indebtedness to Shakespeare, and to Beaumont and Fletcher. In the Appendix there is a very useful account of the stage history of the play, which records about one hundred and fifty performances in America alone.

S. R. GOLDING.

Glimpses of Ben Jonson's London. Dr. N. ZWAGER.
Swets & Zeitlinger, Amsterdam. 1926. Pp. 215.

As a title Dr. Zwager's is a little misleading, because, as he himself points out, his book consists just as much of illustrations taken from all the available Elizabethan writers as of glimpses gathered from the plays of Ben Jonson. Jonson provides him with his point of departure, but little more. The book will be useful to any one who requires a compendium of quotations dealing with the following subjects: Pauls, and any oddities connected therewith; ordinaries; gambling; health-drinking; tobacco; extravagance as revealed

in the accessories of clothing; the affectations of melancholy and of travelling; face-painting; puppet-shows; bull and bear-baiting and the other "sports" of the Bankside rings.

This list of subjects dealt with suggests of itself that the book makes no attempt at the consecutive treatment of a theme. The glimpses are isolated ones, and are taken, as is natural when Jonson is the starting-point, from the satiric angle. This is a pity, as the count of the vices and follies of Elizabethan London has been taken quite often enough in the past. The investigation which can still repay the researcher with something fresh is that of the ordinary life of the time.

The ten illustrations given are well reproduced, but they are, with a few exceptions, those to which we are accustomed in every study of the social life of the age. The *errata* list has caught most but not all of the too-numerous misprints, and has left us the mild amusement of Stubbes' *Anatomy of Muses*.

M. ST. CLARE BYRNE.

The Child Actors: A Study in Elizabethan Stage History.

HAROLD N. HILLEBRAND. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. XI. nos. 1 and 2. February and March 1926. Pp. 355, including Bibliography and Index. Each number price one dollar.

THE history of the companies of child actors divides conveniently at the decade 1590-1600, and this division practically coincides with that of the two parts of Professor Hillebrand's book. He limits his story: he begins with William Cornish, ends in 1616, and omits to consider the activities of the minor Elizabethan companies. Much of his material has been long in print, but he truly claims to have brought to light some new facts and to have put forward new points of view. In a final chapter he raises questions hardly touched on before: he attempts to describe the influence of the boys' companies on dramatic technique and the peculiar characteristics of children's plays.

In the first part he shows how acting by children was common in the mid-sixteenth century, directs attention to the appearance of children in semi-dramatic pageants, and passes to the history of the

Child
refer
down
as fa
Corn
1551
choir
gathe
eccle
1598
West
P
histo
Hille
barre
when
they
Paul
theat
the m
Evan
either
Earl
casts
boys
A
light
1600
of the
Paul
King
Quee
make
Kirk
was p
from
which
of the
In
he do

Children of the Chapel Royal, mainly from 1509-84, but with reference also to the early masters and to occasional performances down to 1592. Happenings under the various masters are described as far as records are available. Wallace's extravagant claims for Cornish are rejected. The history of the Paul's company from 1551-1590 follows in a similar fashion after a consideration of the choir-school, school-house, and theatre. Professor Hillebrand has gathered together scattered printed material and makes use of ecclesiastical manuscripts such as Bishop Bancroft's Visitation of 1598. He also brings forward a bond of Westcote's and gives Westcote's will in full.

Possibly the most interesting conjectures in the first part of this history of the two companies centre on their joint affairs in 1584. Hillebrand believes that in or about 1576 the Chapel children were barred from their usual playing-place—the Chapel Royal—and that when, late in 1583, the first Blackfriars theatre was closed to them, they had no other playing-place in London. He believes that the Paul's children followed the Chapel children at the Blackfriars theatre for a brief period, his theory being that when Westcote, the master of Paul's, died in April 1582, his "deere friende" Henry Evans took over Hunnis's lease (perhaps before November 1583), either on his own initiative or with Lyly and the patronage of the Earl of Oxford. Oxford's boys were the Paul's boys, and if larger casts were required, as with Lyly's *Campaspe* and *Sapho*, the Chapel boys were called in.

At the end of the first part Professor Hillebrand puts in a clear light the circumstances of the opening of the Blackfriars theatre in 1600, and then in the second part he deals with the troublous history of the Children of the Chapel from 1600 to 1608, the history of the Paul's boys from 1599 or 1600 to, possibly, 1609, the history of the King's Revels company at the Whitefriars theatre, and of the second Queen's Revels company there and in its last transformations. He makes quite a few additions to knowledge. He prints the *Daniel v. Kirkham* suit in Chancery (which I found independently and which was printed in the April number of this review), and gives notes from three or four suits in the Court of King's Bench (1607-9), which add details to our knowledge of the conduct of the affairs of the boys' companies.

In dealing with the Blackfriars company, he states (p. 171) that he does not purpose "to go at all deeply into the questions of plays,

authors, and dates," for he is concerned rather with the business than with the literary aspects of the company. Even so, one might ask for consistency: that Day's *Isle of Gulls* be not dated 1605 on p. 191 and 1606 on p. 194; that the play "stolen" by the Chapel children from the King's men be not called *Jeronimo* on p. 172 and *The Spanish Tragedy* (an Admiral's play) on pp. 273 and 293. But the circumstances and date of production of a play are bound up with business affairs—as is obvious with such plays as *Philotas*, *Eastward Ho*, and *Biron*—and this lack of thoroughness detracts, I think, from the value of the book, and certainly from the value of the chronological list of plays in Appendix II. It is irritating to find, to use some of Marston's plays as examples, that *The Malcontent* is dated 1600 on Fleay's slender evidence, that *What You Will* is given to the same company that produced Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels* and *Poetaster*, and that *Sophonisba* is dated before *The Dutch Courtezan*—all without full discussion.

The chapter on the King's Revels at Whitefriars was summarised in an article in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 1922, which apparently appeared too late to be used by Chambers. In it Prof. Hillebrand makes use for the first time of notes from the long-known suit of *Trevill v. Woodford* in the Court of Requests, and gives notes concerning Woodford and others from other suits in the same court and in the King's Bench. In a later chapter he uses the *Alleyne v. Travis* suit in Chancery, known to Halliwell-Phillipps in 1884, which shows Henslowe's concern with the Puddlewharf theatre in Blackfriars. But one or two dates seem to be too arbitrarily decided on: that Keysar first joined the partners of the Blackfriars children in 1607, that the King's men did not take over the Blackfriars theatre until August 1609, and that Keysar in the spring of 1609 took his company from Blackfriars to Whitefriars.

In sum, where Chambers was afraid his history of the children's companies might lapse into "arid annals" we ought to be grateful to Professor Hillebrand for adding flesh to dry bones and for throwing further light on the business aspects of the boys' companies. At the same time we could wish that he had been a little more thorough in the dating of plays.

There are several misprints (e.g. on pp. 46, 63, 107, 131, 149 n., 176, 256), and one or two lax expressions.

R. E. BRETTE.

Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the beginnings to 1642. By OLA ELIZABETH WINSLOW. Private Edition. Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, Illinois. 1926. Pp. xii+186.

THIS is a useful book. It is true that its limitations may easily be demonstrated. In the first place it depends entirely upon plays which have been reprinted in modern times, so that a certain number of comedies of importance for the consideration of its main theme are entirely neglected. Secondly, it belies its title by virtually leaving out of account all the comedies produced between 1616 and 1642. Apparently only *A Match at Midnight*, *The Wild Goose Chase*, *The Court Beggar*, and *A Mad Couple Well Matcht* are chosen from this period. Considering the space which is devoted to minor pre-Shakespearian dramas one feels that here is at least a certain lack of proportion. In addition to these two limitations of the work, there is also to be mentioned the fact that "the dates noted are sometimes those of printing or acting, sometimes those of probable composition." While, of course, critical discussion regarding dates is not required in a book of this kind, the methods outlined in the above quotation are, to say the least, a trifle perplexing.

Apart from these matters Miss Winslow's survey may be heartily praised. Perhaps we have devoted too much time in the past to the tragedy of the Renaissance period; this examination of low comedy elements shows that there still remains a good deal of work to be done on comic motives and devices. Miss Winslow starts with the Miracles, giving fair space to Mak and his companions, passes to the Moralities, and thence travels to the pre-Shakespearian groups. Shakespeare occupies an entire chapter; the later drama is dismissed in little over twenty pages. While occasionally there are lapses into mere cataloguing, Miss Winslow's work is appreciative and suggestive. One of the most interesting portions of her survey is that which concerns the apparently conscious use of a comic episode in order to provide "an impression of lapsed time within the main action." To consider the comic situations in many early plays from this point of view undoubtedly necessitates a fresh critical orientation, and it would seem as if Miss Winslow, in the course of her examination, has been able to show sufficient evidence in favour of definitely conscious artistic purposes among some at least of the

dramatists. The section on Shakespeare is perhaps a trifle unsatisfactory—that Miss Winslow did not devote space to the *Merry Wives of Windsor* seems somewhat strange—and, as was stated above, her later survey is but sketchy. For the analysis of earlier devices, however, her work is of considerable value both to the student of comedy in general and to the student of Elizabethan drama.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy. By KATHLEEN M. LYNCH. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. xii + 242. \$2.50.

MISS LYNCH's study was originally a thesis undertaken "in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Michigan," but has been "considerably enlarged and altered." Her main object is to combat the opinion that Restoration comedy marks "rather a revolution than a development" in English comedy, and to suggest that the perfected comedy of manners was the product of a gradual change. As the drama is an organism which develops, like any living body, from its own resources with the help of external stimulus, there is naturally much in this claim which no sensible critic would deny, and Miss Lynch has done good service by reviewing the treatment of "Platonic love" in seventeenth-century comedy, and pointing out the debt of Congreve to Suckling. She is a discreet advocate, and does not run her main theory to death, though perhaps, while she justly observes that the plot of *The Comical Revenge* presents no new features, she hardly allows enough importance either to the ease and truth to life of the dialogue in Etherege's plays, or to the general opinion, not only of Oldys and later critics, but of the dramatist's own contemporaries, that he had achieved something new in the characters and conversation of comedy. Development there is bound to be, and it may be possible to find suggestions of Congreve's Millamant in Dryden's *Melantha*—but certainly, as Miss Lynch admits, without any of Millamant's charm. And it was charm—a charm unattained before—in which Etherege and Congreve excelled.

Miss Lynch's book is well written, though she permits herself to use the verb "feature" in the manner of picture palace posters. In one small point she does herself less than justice; she alludes

consistently to Cowley's comedy as "*The Cutter of Coleman Street*," and as this is usually a sign of ignorance, it is perhaps permissible to remark that she has obviously read the play.

H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH.

The Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse. Chosen by DAVID NICHOL SMITH. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1926. Pp. xii + 727. Price 8s. 6d. net; India paper, 10s. net.

THIS is one of the most welcome of recent anthologies and will do much to assist the study of a period which, so long neglected, is now, it would seem, coming to its own. The difficulties in the way of studying eighteenth-century poetry have until quite recent times been many and almost insuperable. No person of ordinary digestion can tackle "Anderson" or "Chalmers," and separate editions of any but the best-known writers were either bad or non-existent; lastly, even when satisfactory editions did exist they were often, as in the case of Swift, Defoe, Addison, and Goldsmith, of writers the bulk of whose work was prose, and were thus too expensive or too cumbersome for those whose interest lay mainly in poetry. Such a selection as the one before us was greatly needed, if only because it gives in a complete form and with an authoritative text so much that one has long known in snippets and has never come across in full. I shall not, I hope, be accused of frivolity if I instance Dr. Watts' "Let Dogs delight to bark and bite," "How doth the little busy Bee," and "'Tis the Voice of the Sluggard," and Canning's "Needy Knife-grinder," things well known to all of us—in bits—since childhood, but of which I, at least, have never before met with a complete text; and I am glad to have the authentic version of "God Save the King." In a higher class of work come such things as Tickell's ode "On the Death of Mr. Addison," of which a few lines quoted many years ago in Gosse's *Eighteenth Century Literature*, and thence by others, have long been familiar to every one. They are indeed the best lines, but the whole is well worth acquaintance; and Christopher Smart's "Song to David" and the verses by T. O. Mordaunt from which comes the famous stanza beginning "Sound, sound the clarion, fill the fife," and many other things which we find in this volume, were by no means easy to come by.

It is perhaps questionable whether Mr. Nichol Smith has not been a little over-generous in the space which he has allotted to two or three of the chief authors of the time, such as Pope (52 pages) and Thompson (30 pages), not because this in any way over-represents their real importance in the period, but because most readers of this anthology may be expected to possess their works already in a complete form ; but here we touch on the theory of anthology-making, and there are different views. Some, like myself, would no doubt have preferred that part of these 82 pages should have been given to less well-known authors, but others might reasonably argue that the collection would then afford a less adequate picture of the period as a whole. I am glad to see that in the index of first lines the page, as well as the number, of each item is given. This is a great improvement on the system followed in the previous Oxford anthologies.

R. B. McK.

The Monks and the Giants. By J. H. FRERE. Edited by R. D. WALLER, M.A. Manchester : The University Press. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1926. Pp. 139. 7s. 6d.

THIS is the first volume to be published under the terms of the fund established by the bequest of the late Sir A. W. Ward to the University of Manchester, the income of which is to be devoted to the advancement of research in History and English. If the future editors maintain the high standard of scholarly and accurate editing set by Mr. Waller, we are assured of a series of trustworthy texts and studies.

Frere's clever burlesque, first published in 1817 (cantos 1 and 2) and 1818 (cantos 3 and 4) under the title *Prospectus and Specimen of an intended National Work, by William and Robert Whistlecraft*, has not been printed separately since 1842 ; it is time, therefore, that an edition such as we now have should appear. The work was never popular and is now chiefly remembered because of the influence it exercised on Byron ; nevertheless it is still worth reading—once. Mr. Waller has collated the editions ; he has added notes, where notes are necessary ; and he has prefixed an Introduction, of some fifty pages, in which he treats in scholarly fashion of the Italian serio-comic romance in general and the Italian romance in England. In the latter he shows that Frere, and not William Stewart Rose,

was the first to naturalize the new style, the *ottava rima*, in England. Mr. Waller has also added two bibliographies, one of the poem, the other of the subject; the latter does not claim to be exhaustive, but I think he would have done well to have included Mr. Einstein's monograph on Pulci (*Literarhistorische Forschungen*, 1902).

The book is very accurately printed, the only slip noted being *primo* for *prima* (p. 134). It is to be hoped that in the future volumes published under the terms of the Ward Bequest, it will be found possible to print the notes in minion and not in small-faced nonpareil.

A definitive edition.

L. F. POWELL.

The Origins of Poe's Critical Theory. By MARGARET ALTERTON. (University of Iowa Humanistic Studies, vol. ii., No. 3.) Pp. 191. \$2.

THE author of this thesis seems never to have made up her mind whether she is dealing with Poe's theory of literature, or with the conscious practices of his creative art, or with his principles of criticism, or with his mannerisms as a book-reviewer for the magazines, or with the sources for the matter of his tales and the hints for his way of telling them. She is perpetually straining to be profound and fails to grasp the obvious. The technical phrase "novel of effect" for a tale of terror involves her in ludicrously elaborate confusions between the ordinary and special senses of a common word, and is illuminated by certified propositions as momentous as this, that "certain authors testify to their intention of creating an impression on the reader." Poe's "tendency to criticise the arrangement of subject-matter in law books" (when the poor man in his capacity of reviewer had to say something about books on topics outside his knowledge) is made to have a vital bearing on his literary doctrine, and provides one reason for a chapter on Poe's intercourse with lawyers and the law. A casual remark that in good poetry there is a nice adaptation of its constituent parts, and the discovery that theologians find God's wisdom in the nice adaptation of each element in nature to its appointed end, are as good an excuse as the others for half a chapter on Poe's reading in the Christian theologians; and so on. Erudition could scarcely be more wrong-headed. There is typical naivety, and disturbing inaccuracy, in the note that "*Blackwood* critics may have had a first-

hand knowledge of Aristotelian criticism ; North refers to Pope's and Twining's translation of the *Poetica*."

H. B. C.

Tennyson as seen by his Parodists. By Dr. J. POSTMA. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam. 1926. Pp. 200. Price 8s.

OUT-OF-DATE parody is a dreary thing save in those rare cases in which it is both an original work of merit and a sound criticism of its subject. Any one can write a bad parody of a good poem, and it must be admitted that many of those which Dr. Postma has unearthed are very bad indeed, at least when, so to speak, served up cold on a scholar's table, even though some of them, and especially those with a political point, may have been amusing enough when written. Nevertheless, parodies have their place in literary history ; in their way they are a kind of flattery, and they do at least show the importance in popular esteem of the man whose work is parodied. In the essay which occupies the first half of this volume the author discusses parody in general and gives us an interesting study of Tennyson's reputation as reflected in the parodies of his work. The second half consists of a reprint of fifty of the parodies. Dr. Postma has carried out a dull task intelligently and well.

R. B. McK.

St. Erkenwald, a Middle English Poem. Edited by H. L. SAVAGE. Yale Studies in English, LXXII. New Haven : Yale University Press ; London : Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1926. Pp. lxxx.+96. 8s. 6d.

DR. SAVAGE's book has the disadvantage of following on Sir I. Gollancz's edition of 1922. He brings forward the theory that the poet may have got much of his material from a single source rather than from the many that Sir I. Gollancz adduces, and suggests the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris, pointing out that there is ground for the belief that St. Paul's had a copy. The description of the tomb and its discovery is certainly very like that of the tomb of St. Alban in the *Chronica*, much more so than that cited by Sir I. Gollancz from the *Troy Book* ; on the other hand, the account of the appearance of the body of St. Edmund in the *Chronica*, claimed by Dr. Savage (p. xxiv., note) as being slightly closer than the account

in Bede of St. Cuthbert, differs from it in two details only, the scent of the body and the appearance of the hair, which are not mentioned in the poem.

But the *Chronica* gives no authority for the most striking element in our story, that of a pagan soul released from hell through baptism. Stories of souls being helped through purgatory by prayers and masses (a commonplace of Catholic belief) abounded everywhere. Dr. Savage quotes some of these from the *Chronica*, and alludes to St. Erkenwald's mass. But this was not said for the judge, who does not mention it, but says that the baptism saved him.

Dr. Savage includes a discussion of the dialect, which he finds to be North-West Midland. He considers that the dialect of the MS. is that of the original poem (though noting differences between it and that of the Cotton MS.), and that it may safely be attributed to the "West Midland Poet." More evidence might perhaps be brought forward here. A close analysis of the metre and use of final *e* would probably bring out striking parallels between this poem and *Cleanness* and *Patience*. The habit of alliterating unstressed syllables, adduced by Dr. Savage, belongs to all the unrhymed alliterative verse except *Winner and Waster* and *The Parliament of the Three Ages*. One would also like to know more of the dependence of *Death and Life* on this poem, for the two parallels cited seem to have little in common beyond their subjects.

In the footnotes to the text are given the MS. glosses, a useful addition. The emendations are much fewer than in Sir I. Gollancz's text. Sometimes the original text is justified, as in "cure" and "tethe" (ll. 168, 297), and perhaps in "burghe" (l. 103), though the examples quoted in the note are in favour of the emendation. But in ll. 190, 321, the unemended text gives an impossible metre, and it is difficult to believe that the poet could have written "sum lant goste lyfe," meaning "some spirit (which has been) lent life." Again, though it is possible to explain the *o* in "love" (34), and "glow" (171), as a WM. spelling of the rounded vowel resulting from OE. *ēo*, it is hard to follow Dr. Savage when he accounts similarly for "glotte" from OF. *glette* (l. 297, note), and compares with the last word "loffynge" (292), which he connects with OE. *læfan*. He derives "roynyshe" from OE. *rȳne*, and explains the spelling as due to the northern development of *ō*, spelt "oi," to *ū*, as seen in the northern "oys" for "use." This seems an excellent suggestion.

MABEL DAY.

John Page's "Siege of Rouen." Kritische Textausgabe von
Dr. HERBERT HUSCHER. Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, Bd. 1.
Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1927. Pp. xii+248.

THIS is the first critical edition of John Page's *Siege of Rouen*, an account by an eye-witness of the siege of that town by Henry V. in 1418-19. Its value is historical rather than literary, but we must accept the author's apology that he made it—

Alle in raffe and not in ryme
By-cause of space he hadde no tyme.
But whenne thys werre ys at an ende
And he haue lyffe, he wylle hit amende.

Dr. Huscher, in his excellent classification of the many MSS. of the poem, shows that if he carried out this promise, the results have not reached us. His editor has, however, done his best for him in providing a very careful critical text, with an investigation of the dialect, date, and historical value of the poem, together with the first attempt made towards an identification of the author. The original dialect is Northern or North Midland. Dr. Huscher inclines to place the poem in the West Riding or thereabouts. (It might be noted here, as regards dialect tests, that though all authorities give *ong > ung* as a specifically West Midland change, it abounds in the South-Eastern *Palladius on Husbondrie*.) The metre he derives, rather startlingly, from ME. unrhymed alliterative verse, and in doing this allows a great many doubtful cases of alliteration (e.g. those of *w* and *wh* on p. 103) which may well be accidental. From his examination of the metre he concludes that final *e* is syllabic inside the line, but not at the end. This, he points out, disagrees with Professor Luick's results for alliterative verse, but on the other hand I think that it will be found to agree with the practice in *Pearl* and the rhyming lines in *Sir Gawain*. The quality of the rhyme is exceedingly good, and indeed better than Dr. Huscher makes out, for his cases of rhyme between open and close *ē* (p. 96) are only apparent, "bete" (l. 75), being a strong past tense, "eke" becoming close in late OE., and the other two deriving from PG. *æ*, and consequently close in this dialect.

The text is reproduced from MS. Egerton 1995, with emendations and collations from four other MSS., full notes, and a useful glossary. The capitals are normalised (it is rather a pity to write

"Ff" for "ff"), and the verses divided into couplets. The following criticisms and suggestions may be offered :

l. 120 : "lode" cannot come from the pp. of OE. *hladan*. Possibly the text should read, "per vppon lode,"=there on its way.

l. 597 : "sterre," from OE. *styrian*, is difficult to justify both as regards meaning and phonology. In spite of its not appearing in any MS., I should suggest "[ch]erre,"=return.

l. 950 : "roke," with close *ō*, cannot come from OE. *racian*. The ME. verb "hoke" would give the correct rhyme, and its rarity in this meaning would easily cause scribal corruption ; cp. *Allit. Troy Bk.* 4621, "hokit out of hauyn," and *Sege Jerus.* 872, "to hoke out of toun."

l. 1015 : here B, which Dr. Huscher rejects (p. 64), gives good sense ; "nother knowen ne straunge"=neither friend nor stranger, i.e. no one at all. This would more easily be corrupted to the reading of the text than *vice versa*.

ll. 1069-70 : Gairdner's emendation of "answare" to "answ[o]re," accepted by Dr. Huscher, gives an unusual form. It is simpler to change "sore" to "sare," as the editor has done in l. 1120.

l. 1135 : "tredyd" is a misprint for "treyd."

l. 1279 : "newelle" ; if this="noel," then the MS. "nowewell" would be a better spelling.

These, however, are small and possibly doubtful points. The whole book is a propitious opening for the new series.

MABEL DAY.

The Year's Work in English Studies. Vol. VI. 1925. Edited for the English Association by F. S. BOAS and C. H. HERFORD. Oxford University Press. London : Humphrey Milford. 1927. Pp. 345. Price 7s. 6d. net (to members of the English Association, 3s. 6d. net).

The Year's Work continues to increase in size and value from year to year, the present volume containing 27 pages more than that for 1924 and 76 more than the previous one. So far as one can detect, this increase is merely the inevitable result of a greater output of work on the subjects dealt with ; there is no padding whatever,

and only so much discussion as is necessary to explain the purpose and scope of the books or articles dealt with. The list of contributors is the same as that of last year, save that Professor Herford now writes the opening chapter, on General Works of Literary History and Criticism, instead of Professor Abercrombie; Miss Dorothy Everett deals with Middle English in place of Professor E. V. Gordon, who this year is responsible only for the Old English chapter; and Sir Edmund Chambers contributes the chapter on Shakespeare in place of Professor Reed. It need only be said that the whole of the work seems to have been done as excellently as usual, and that the volume is quite indispensable to all serious students of English, while the price—at least to members of the English Association—is absurdly low.

R. B. McK.

A Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books printed abroad, 1475-1640. Compiled by A. W. POLLARD and G. R. REDGRAVE. London: The Bibliographical Society. 1926. Pp. xvi + 609. [Issued to non-members by Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., 63s.]

As I grow older I feel increasingly certain that there is no man of letters who deserves better of the community than the compiler of a good index. A man has but a certain number of hours during which to work, and whoever saves some of these hours by the abridgment of mechanical labour prolongs his effective life and enables him to make more and better use of his acquired knowledge and experience. Such a volume as Messrs. Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-Title Catalogue*, the latest and to the literary student the most useful of the publications of the Bibliographical Society, will save to future researchers in the period which it covers innumerable hours of toil. The first thing which one generally wishes to discover about a book in which one is interested, is where a copy of it is to be seen, and in the case of the rarer works and editions of our earlier literature this has often been, save for some groups which have been especially studied, a matter of the greatest difficulty. Indications given in the older works of reference are frequently wrong, and many books in private collections have changed hands in recent times,

with the result that search in a number of catalogues was always necessary, and sometimes much correspondence, before a copy could be traced. Henceforward there will be no need for this. Here in a single volume we have, clearly indicated, the libraries in which copies of each edition are to be found; in the case of the commoner books those libraries being mentioned which are most easily accessible to students, in the case of the rarer the whereabouts of all known copies being indicated, to the number of five or six in England and five or six in America. The care with which the interests of students have been considered by always giving the preference to copies in public libraries, only citing those in private or relatively less accessible collections when none were available in the former, is an especially admirable feature of the book. Its value has also been greatly increased by the addition of the dates of entry in the Stationers' Register, to which it thus supplies in great measure the place of the long-desired index of titles.

It is an enormous piece of work, containing as it does over 26,000 separate title-entries, and the compilers have necessarily had to depend in part on the entries in a variety of catalogues drawn up on somewhat different principles and perhaps of different degrees of accuracy. That a work of the kind should be absolutely complete and free from minor errors will be expected by no one of the slightest experience in bibliographical matters, least of all by the compilers, but there is, I think, no doubt that time will show that a very high degree of accuracy has been attained. A certain number of unknown books or editions are sure to come to light, and there are perhaps a few known ones of a minor sort which have escaped the compilers' net. I am not sure to what extent they intended to include such ephemeral literature as broadsides, but if they aimed at listing all of these they would seem to have overlooked a certain number of interesting items in the collection of broadsides owned by the Society of Antiquaries, among others two ballads attributed to John Heywood. Other items in the same collection are, however, included, and it is therefore not impossible that those which I have been unable to find are entered elsewhere.

This brings me to the one criticism, and it is a very minor one, that I have to make, namely, that in a few instances attributions of authorship have been accepted the correctness of which can certainly not be regarded as proved, and the entries placed under such putative authors instead of the books being treated as anonymous

or placed under the name which actually appears on them.* I admit, indeed, that in a reference book such as this, there is some practical convenience in the plan which has been followed. It is certainly easier to turn up *Tamburlaine* under Marlowe, and *The Spanish Tragedy* under Kyd than to have to remember to look under "Tímúr, Great Khan of the Mongols" and "Horatio," where they are to be found in the British Museum Catalogue; but it seems to me that this convenience is dearly bought by the obscuring of the fact that neither attribution is really certain. For my own part I cannot help wishing that the more formal method had been adopted and the head-entry always placed under the ostensible name, or, in the case of anonymous books, under the title, of course with cross-references from all reasonable or current attributions. The persistence of unfounded attributions from times when any guess was regarded as better than none is no small hindrance to the progress of English studies, for it is very difficult, even for those who are aware of the evidence or the want of it, to preserve an open mind in the face of reiterated statement.

The compilers of the *Short-Title Catalogue* and the numerous scholars who assisted them have indeed earned the gratitude of all who are interested in the study of English. There is, I believe, no one book which will be found so generally useful to students of Tudor and Stuart literature, or which is so absolutely indispensable in any reference library that attempts to cover these periods.

R. B. MCKERROW.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

On the Relation of Poetry to Verse. By Sir PHILIP HARTOG, C.I.E., LL.D. (The English Association, Pamphlet No. 64.) 2s. 6d. net; to members 1s.

In the main an attempt to answer the question "Why is poetry written in verse?" Discusses the views of many critics as to the function and importance of metrical form in the presentation of poetical ideas.

* To give a single instance, *The Trimming of Tom Nashe*, 1597, which purports to be by one Richard Lichfield, is placed here, without even a query, under the name of Gabriel Harvey, to whom there is really no shadow of reason for attributing it save that it is an attack upon Harvey's enemy, Nashe. There is, to be sure, a cross-reference from Lichfield, but it seems a pity that the authority of a book of this kind should be given to an attribution which is almost certainly incorrect.

A Question of Taste. By JOHN BAILEY. (The English Association, Pamphlet No. 65.) 2s. 6d. net; to members 1s.

Discusses the permanence of generally accepted judgments as to literary and artistic values, arguing that "in spite of apparent exceptions, there has on the whole been quite a remarkable stability [from the earliest known periods] in aesthetic opinion."

The Structure of "Wuthering Heights." By C. P. S. (The Hogarth Essays.) London: Published by Leonard and Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press. 1926. Pp. 24. 2s. 6d. net.

An interesting analysis of the structure of Emily Brontë's novel. The extraordinary symmetry of the pedigree of the Earnshaw and Linton families, which indeed many readers have noticed, is well brought out, and there is a detailed chronological table of the events of the story. The author's question whether Emily Brontë worked with a calendar may however, it seems, easily be answered in the negative, for while the indications of days of the week within the months of January and March 1784 are consistent, the months are inconsistent with one another. January 6 is given as Monday, and March 13 also as Monday, but from the one date to the other is nine weeks and four days. Actually the days were Tuesday and Saturday respectively. The discussion of the legal aspect of the story is particularly interesting, as it seems to show a knowledge of the contemporary law of property which one would perhaps hardly have expected from the author of *Wuthering Heights*.

Another Future of Poetry. By ROBERT GRAVES. (The Hogarth Essays.) London: Published by Leonard and Virginia Woolf, at the Hogarth Press. 1926. Pp. 34. 2s. 6d. net.

A reply to certain views on poetry recently expressed by Mr. Robert Trevelyan and Mr. J. B. S. Haldane, which, however, contains far more original and penetrating criticism than we are accustomed to in such discussions. The views which Mr. Graves puts forward on several matters, among others the importance of typography in the presentation of poems, are of a kind to provoke hot argument, but those who, like the present writer, can derive little or no pleasure from poetry in small or mean print (useful as small-print editions are for reference), will be in cordial agreement with what he writes. Certain other points which Mr. Graves makes show how desirable it is that writers on metrical subjects should be at the pains to acquire such elementary knowledge of phonetics as would enable them clearly to distinguish between verse as spoken and the written or printed representation of it. Such knowledge would save much futile discussion, for several fallacies which it is necessary to mention in a paper of this kind, such as that "the space between printed letters and the space between printed words represent an actual time-interval," would vanish of their own accord, and we should not be wearied with them any more.

The Poet's Eye. By VERNON LEE, Litt.D. (The Hogarth Essays.) London: Published by Leonard and Virginia Woolf, at the Hogarth Press. 1926. Pp. 20. 1s. 6d. net.

Described as "Notes on some differences between verse and prose," this is a discussion of "the power of *verse as verse* to transform the obvious into the memorable, to call forth and justify far-fetched (occasionally doubtful) metaphors and high-flown descriptions. The power of *verse as verse* to turn him who employs it from a prose-writer into a poet."

Some "Echoes" in Elizabethan Drama of Shakespeare's "King Henry the Fourth," Parts I. and II., considered in Relation to the Text of those Plays. By R. P. COWL. Helsingfors: Frenckellska Tryckeri Aktiebolaget; London: Elkin Mathews & Marrot, Ltd. 1926. Pp. 27. 2s. net.

The theory put forward is that many reminiscences of Shakespearian passages are found in the work of later dramatists, that these are probably mainly derived from a knowledge of the plays as performed on the stage, and hence that they may in some cases give us a better text than that of the early printed editions, or suggest valuable emendations therein. This is indeed evidently true, and it is possible that a collection of such "echoes" may be of occasional assistance in Shakespearian criticism, but it seems unlikely to produce any great result. After all, much criticism of the text of Shakespeare or any other writer has always been based on parallel phrases found in the work of his contemporaries, whether claimed to be "echoes" or merely examples of current language showing what might be expected. The long series of "echoes" of 1 and 2 *Henry IV.*, collected by Professor Cowl, are indeed helpful as showing that certain editorial emendations were unnecessary, but it is not clear that in any single case they give us a new or certain reading.

Third Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS. New Haven, Connecticut (The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences). 1926. \$1.50.

This third supplement to Professor Wells's well-known *Manual*, contains additions and modifications to June, 1926. It is hardly necessary at this date to say anything in praise of this valuable guide to current work in Middle-English, which has indeed long ago been accepted as indispensable to all serious students of the subject. The plan of the work is of course already fixed by the original *Manual* and the previous supplements, but I would suggest for the consideration of the compiler, whether it would not be possible to indicate in some rather more conspicuous way new *editions* of the works dealt with. This could perhaps be done by printing the word "Ed." in heavier type, and inserting a short dash or other mark before the list of articles and notes on particular points. Further, even though it perhaps hardly accords with the scheme of the book, it would certainly be useful if there could somewhere be an indication, however brief, of the contents of such editions as include more than one work. We may need to know what is contained in such a selection as Prof. Adams's *Chief Pre-Shakespearian Dramas*, or whether, for example, Prof. Gollancz's facsimile of *Pearl* is of that poem alone or of the whole MS. in which it appears. We can indeed often obtain this information by a comparison of several entries, but only at the cost of some time and trouble.

R. B. McK.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. IX., August 1927—

Contributions to English Syntax: On the History of Conversion in English (E. Kruisinga), pp. 103-08.

HERRIG'S ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITERATUREN, Vol. 152 (New Series 52), June 1927—

Zur Textgestaltung der mittellenglischen Bearbeitung von Susos Orologium Sapientiæ (G. Schleich), pp. 36-50.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVI., April 1927—

Milton's Use of Biblical Quotations (Harris Fletcher), pp. 145-65.

The Development of Old English *æg*, *eah* in Middle English, I. (Mary S. Serjeantson), pp. 198-225.

Concluded July, pp. 350-400.

—July—

Active Arcite, Contemplative Palamon (Hoxie N. Fairchild), pp. 285-93.

Suggested allegorical interpretation of *The Knight's Tale*.

Variety Entertainment by Elizabethan Strolling Players (Louis B. Wright), pp. 294-303.

The Fall of Hyperion (C. L. Finney), pp. 304-24.

LIBRARY, Vol. VIII., June 1927—

Keep the Widow Waking: A Lost Play by Dekker (Charles Sisson), pp. 39-57.

Two Hitherto Unrecorded Editions of *Robinson Crusoe* (H. C. Hutchins), pp. 58-72.

The Library of Dover Priory: Its Catalogue and Extant Volumes (C. R. Haines), pp. 73-118.

A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres (B. M. Ward and W. W. Greg), pp. 123-30.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XVI., May 1927—

Bibliographies of Modern Authors (Gwendolen Murphy), pp. 70-75.
Walter de la Mare (b) Prose; Edward Thomas.
Continued, June, pp. 193-98.

—June 1927—

An Early Victorian Tragedy (D. C. Somerwell), pp. 170-78.
Strafford.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLII., May 1927—

Recent Works on Prose Fiction before 1800 (E. Bernbaum), pp. 281-93.
The Comedy *Lingua* and Du Bartas' *La Sepmaine* (M. P. Tilley),
pp. 293-99.

A French Text-Book by Robert Browning (L. Stevenson), pp. 299-305.
Identification of reference in letter of September 17, 1845.

Some Allusions to Spenser (D. Bush), pp. 314-16.

A Note on Shakespeare and Nash (George R. Coffman), pp. 317-19.
1 *Henry IV.*, iv. i. 97-110 and *The Unfortunate Traveller*.

Two Notes on Uncle Toby (J. Homer Caskey), pp. 321-23.
Possible indebtedness to Edward Moore.

Tracing an Epigram (J. Homer Caskey).
Origin of passage in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*.

—June—

An English *Faustsplitter* (J. A. Walz), pp. 353-65.
Reference in Fynes Moryson's *Itinerary*.

The Personal Relations between Denham and Waller (T. H. Banks),
pp. 372-78.

A Test for Udall's Authorship (L. Bradner), pp. 378-80.
Predominance of the twelve syllable line.

The Early Stage History of the First Heroic Play (W. S. Clark),
pp. 381-83.
Orrery's *General*.

Leigh Hunt and *The Plain Dealer* (G. D. Stout), pp. 383-85.

Correspondence relating to the Grant of a Civil List Pension to William
Wordsworth, 1842 (P. Knaplund), pp. 385-89.

Analogues of the Story of Cædmon (F. Klaeber), p. 390.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXII., July 1927—

Notes on Old and Middle English (Cyril Brett), pp. 257-64.

Riddles 58 and 16; *Phoenix*, 404 ff.; *Maldon*, 46-8; *Bestiary*, 598; *Piers
Plowman*, B. VI. 124 and Prol. 123 ff.; *Owl and Nightingale* 961-2, 816 and
80; *Canterbury Tales*, B. 782 ff.

Stage Duelling in the Elizabethan Theatre (Louis B. Wright),
pp. 265-75.

- Beowulf*, ll. 1086-1088 (R. A. Williams), pp. 310-13.
The Wanderer, ll. 41-3 (Margaret Ashdown), pp. 113-14.
 The Play of *Marcus Geminus* and its Source (Leicester Bradner),
 pp. 314-17.
 Marston born in Oxfordshire (R. E. Brettell), pp. 317-19.
 Elyot's *Governour* and Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman* (D. T. Starnes),
 pp. 319-22.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIV., May 1927—

- Some Early Masks and Morris Dances (Lucile Ferguson), pp. 409-417.
 From *Chroniques de Yolande de France*: Relation of French and English
 masks.
 Conventional Features of Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucrez* (Charles R.
 Baskervill), pp. 419-42.
 Documents and Records: Chaucer's Debt to Walter Bukholt (Edith
 Rickert), pp. 503-05.

MONTHLY CRITERION, Vol. VI., July 1927—

- Chaucer and the Great Italian Writers of the Trecento—I. (Mario
 Praz), pp. 18-39.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, July 1927—

- Jane Austen and a Forgotten Dramatist (M. Alderton Pink),
 pp. 125-34.
 Kotzebue.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 152, May 7, 1927—

- Rainsford Associations with Shakespeare, Southampton and Hall
 (Alfred Ransford), pp. 330-33.
 Continued May 28, pp. 383-85; June 11, pp. 419-22; June 18, pp. 438-40.
 Textual Notes on Shakespeare: *The Winter's Tale* (S. O. Addy),
 pp. 336-37.
 On II. i. 142.
 Hartley Coleridge (Thomas O. Mabbott), p. 338.
 Unpublished verses.

May 14—

- Shakespeare's Lost Home (William Poel), pp. 345-7.

May 21—

- The Stapol in Beowulf*: Hall and Chamber (S. O. Addy), pp. 363-65.
 The Place-Names Medmenham and Medmenny (A. Anscombe),
 pp. 373-74.

May 28—

- The Date of Chaucer's *Prologue* (Bernard R. Conrad), p. 385.

"Sear" (F. C. Morgan), pp. 385-86.

Note by Joseph E. Sandford, July 9, pp. 31-32.

Graves's *Spiritual Quixote* (Edward Bensly), p. 392.

Identity of characters. Further note, June 11, p. 429.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 152, June 4—

The Name of Croydon (A. Anscombe), pp. 401-02.

Note by Francis P. Marchant, June 18, p. 447.

—June 18—

Mrs. Barbauld (T. Cann Hughes), p. 441.

A Thought on Death.

—Vol. 153, July 2—

Goldsmith and *A Concise History of England* (R. W. Seitz), pp. 3-4.

Evidence of authorship.

—July 23—

Pl.-Names of Places in Domesday ending with—*intune* (Alfred Anscombe), pp. 59-62.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VI., July 1927—

The Relation of the First Quarto Version to the First Folio Version of Shakespeare's *Henry V.* (Hardin Craig), pp. 225-34.

Wordsworth and Hugh Blair (E. C. Knowlton), pp. 277-81.

Milton's Puritanism ; or, the Issue Clouded (Elbert N. S. Thompson), pp. 291-4.

Notes on Shakespeare's Classical Mythology (Douglas Bush), pp. 295-302.

The Renewal of the Hundred Years' War in Shakespeare (A. R. Benham), pp. 303-6.

Unnoted Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in *Twelfth Night* (M. P. Tilley), pp. 306-11.

Thomas Kyd's early Company connections (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 311-13.

Chauceriana (H. B. Hinckley), pp. 313-14.

Three, not very important, classical parallels.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLII., June 1927—

Attila's and Beowulf's Funerals (Frederick Klaeber), pp. 255-67.

Hrethric (Kemp Malone), pp. 268-313.

Relations of story in *Beowulf* and other sources.

Vercelli Homily VIII. and the *Christ* (Rudolph Willard), pp. 314-30.

The Old English Weak Preterites without Medial Vowel (Eduard Prokosch), pp. 331-38.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 503

- Bacon's Influence on John Hall (Edmund L. Freeman), pp. 385-99.
 An Obscure Analogue of *The Compleat Angler* (Claude Lloyd), pp. 400-03.
 Robert Boyle's *Occasional Reflections*, fourth section.
Mary Hamilton: The Group Authorship of Ballads (Albert H. Tolman), pp. 422-32.
 Macpherson on Pinkerton: Literary Amenities of the Eighteenth Century (W. A. Craigie), pp. 433-42.
 MS. notes in Macpherson's copy of *Ancient Scottish Poems*.
 The Abbé Prevost and the English Novel (James R. Foster), pp. 443-64.
 Rossetti's Reading and his Critical Opinions (Albert M. Turner), pp. 465-91.
 Personal Experience in Rossetti's *House of Life* (Ruth C. Wallerstein), pp. 492-504.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIV., April 1927—

- Concerning Nature in *The Countesse of Pembroke's Arcadia* (Lois Whitney), pp. 207-22.
 Structural Unity in the Two Parts of *Henry the Fourth* (Robert A. Law), pp. 223-42.
 An Introduction to the Study of the Text of *Richard III.* (Robert W. Babcock), pp. 243-60.
 Extraneous Song in Elizabethan Drama after the Advent of Shakespeare (Louis B. Wright), pp. 261-74.
Appius and Virginia: By Webster and Heywood (Henry D. Gray), pp. 275-89.
 Recent Literature of the English Renaissance (Hardin Craig), pp. 290-382.
 Critical Bibliography.

—July—

- Emerson and Carlyle (Frank T. Thompson), pp. 438-53.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 5, 1927—

- Thomas Gray and Norton Nicholls (Leonard Whibley), p. 318.
 Further note by R. Martin, May 12, p. 336.
 A "Unique" Bunyan (David Waterston), p. 318.
A Discourse of the Building, Nature, Excellency and Government of the House of God, 1688. Note by I. G. M. Shelley, May 26, p. 380.
 Chaucer's Astrology in *The Knight's Tale* (P. E. Dustoor), p. 318.
 Smollett's Imprisonment (Harold Stein), p. 318.
 Evidence of exact date.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 12—

Cashel Incunabula in Dublin (Newport B. White), p. 336.

Sheridan and the *Ode to Scandal* (Percival F. Hinton), p. 336.

Reply by P. J. Dobell, May 26, p. 375.

The Name Chaucer (S. C. Wilson), p. 336.

Occurrence in an Order of Edward II. Note by Walter Rye, May 19, p. 355.

—May 19—

Harington's Epigrams (Norman E. McClure), p. 355.

Identification of people satirized. Further letter by V. T. Harlow, July 14, p. 488.

Lewis Carroll Letters (Robert E. Baker), p. 355.

Hitherto unprinted letter of February 8, 1887.

—May 26—

Hamlet's "Fatness" (Waldo H. Dunn), p. 375.

Evidence for meaning "sweaty." Further notes by John P. Graham and Flinders Petrie, June 2, p. 392.

Two Medieval Parallels to *The Critic* (W. B. Sedgwick), p. 375.

In Joseph of Exeter and *Ysengrimus*.

Robin Hood (W. H. B. Bird), p. 375.

Occurrence of name in records.

Lady Conyers of Great Stoughton—A Mistaken Identification (Paget Toynbee), p. 375.

—June 2—

Barnes *Supplication* (Henry Robinson), p. 392.

Evidence of origin.

A By-Form of the Word "Slaughter" (H. G. Wood), p. 392.

Further evidence of form "slafter," Henry Jenner, June 9, p. 408; L. R. M. Strachan, June 16, p. 424; Charles Whitby, June 23, p. 440.

"Sentimental" (Hibernicus), p. 392.

Use of word by Sterne earlier than recorded in O.E.D. Reply by Lewis P. Curtis, June 23, p. 440; rejoinder by Margaret R. B. Shaw, July 21, p. 504.

—June 9—

Chaucer as Controller (John M. Manly), p. 408.

Memoranda in Record Office.

The Owl and the Nightingale (J. P. Gilson), p. 408.

Note on vv. 493, 4.

Bibliography of Dean Swift (Newport B. White), p. 408.

Editions not recorded by Temple Scott.

—June 16—

Charles Lamb and the Rule in "Shelley's Case" (T. Cyprian Williams), p. 424.

Note on letter of February 2, 1829.

Milton's "Two-handed Engine" (George M. Harper), p. 424.

Reply by N. W. Hill, July 28, p. 520.

Shakespeare Allusions in Shadwell (Gordon Crosse), p. 424.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, June 23—

A Keats Replica (Noel Douglas), p. 440.

Identity of edition found on body of Shelley.

—June 30—

Thomas Middleton, pp. 445-46.

A Coincidence (Hibernicus), p. 456.

Hayley and Gabriele Rossetti.

A Misplaced Paragraph in *Gulliver's Travels*, p. 460.

Note by Harold Williams, July 28, p. 520.

—July 7—

Sir John Denham's Translations of Virgil (F. E. Hutchinson), p. 472.

An Unrecorded King of East Anglia (O. K. Schram), p. 472.

Origin of place-name Attleborough. Reply by Katharine M. Buck,
July 14, p. 488.

The "Disputacyon of Noblenes" (John Purves), p. 472.

Note on *Fulgens and Lucres*.

Cashel Books in Marsh's Library (Newport B. White), p. 472.

"Sionites" in Gray's Letters (Paget Toynbee), p. 472.

Explanation of reference.

—July 21—

Gray's Visit to Oxfordshire in 1760 (Paget Toynbee), p. 504.

Further note, July 28, p. 520.

A Crux in *King Lear* (R. H. Case), p. 504.

III. vii. 65. Note by H. Cuninghame, July 28, p. 520.

Carlyle's *French Revolution*—A Suggestion (Henry Broadbent),

p. 504.

Apparent slip in vol. II. p. 278.

—July 28—

An Essay by Shelley (John M. Turnbull), p. 520.

Authorship of *A True Story*.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1927

B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

BELFAST.—English Literature :

Class II.—Rachel A. Carson, Memmi E. Gaffikin, Mary R. Pinkerton, Laura Wood.

Class III.—Edna R. Baird, R. C. Calvert, Helen A. Fahy, Rosaleen A. Kerr, Joyce Roome.

BIRMINGHAM.—English :

Class I.—Dorothy L. Chadwick, Louise I. D. Coleman.

Class II.—Beryl M. Aylward, Doris G. Bloomer, Silvia M. Goodall, R. O. Harnshaw, Dorothy D. Hodge, Dorothy G. B. Hubbard, A. B. Jamieson, Olive M. Jones, Grace Malins, Margaret E. Manley, Winifred A. Pidgeon, F. S. Pinder, G. E. Tansley, Margaret K. Taylor, Dorothy Young.

Class III.—Constance M. Green, W. H. Lowe, J. Mattocks, A. E. Ruddock.

Classified on completion of subsidiary requirements.

Class II.—Kathleen M. Coldicott.

BRISTOL.—English :

Class I.—A. A. Evans, Maureen P. McGrath, W. R. Niblett, Phyllis M. Thomas.

Class II.—*Div. 1* :—Norah A. Davis, Muriel G. Green, A. Hobby, R. F. Jones. *Div. 2* : Vera H. M. Dowling, Phyllis I. Ransom, Mabel M. Price, Joyce E. A. Thomas, Audrey L. Webley.

Class III.—Margaret E. Padmore, Constance E. Sedgley, Gwladys I. Taylor, Annie M. Winchester.

CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos :

Class I.—W. P. Barrett (*A**) (Joh.), F. J. R. Bottrall (*A*) (Pemb.), A. E. Brewin (*A*) (Emm.), D. C. W. Harding (*A*) (Emm.), A. J. Jenkinson (*A*) (Emm.), L. J. Lloyd (*A*) (Emm.), J. L. Longland (*A**) (Jes.), J. L. Palmer (*A*) (Emm.), I. M. Parsons (*A*) (Trin.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : C. R. Allison (*a*) (Cath.), T. R. Barnes (*a*) (King's), H. M. Bell (*a*) (Cla.), H. E. Bench (*a*) (Down.), K. L. Desai (*a, b*) (non-coll.), A. Houghton (*a*) (Emm.), G. P. Hussey (*a*) (Selw.), E. W. N. Mallows (*a*) (Queens'), H. A. S. Pink (*a*) (Selw.), K. A. Povah (*a*) (Emm.), W. T. J. Purbrick (*a*) (Down.), W. S. J. Staples (*a*) (Christ's), B. E.

Towers (*a*) (Queens'), D. H. Watts (*a*) (Queens'), C. F. Weekes (*a*) (Trin.), G. F. Williams (*a*) (Selw.), H. Yaffe (*a*) (Jes.). *Div. 2* : J. B. Annand (*a*) (Pemb.), W. E. Barron (*b*) (Jes.), J. R. Bateman (*a*) (Magd.), G. T. Beckwith (*a*) (Cla.), P. H. Clarkson (*a*) (Down.), G. F. Eastwood (*a*) (Jes.), C. T. Eddy (*a*) (Queens'), E. P. Gee (*a*) (Emm.), R. W. Gibb (*a*) (Selw.), T. F. Gibbs (*a*) (Cath.), K. A. C. Gross (*a*) (Jes.), J. B. Grubb (*a*) (Joh.), K. W. Haworth (*a*) (Jes.), C. G. Hutchinson (*a*) (Emm.), W. P. Jenson (*a*) (Queens'), E. O. D. Keown (*a*), (Pemb.), W. Q. Lash (*a*) (Emm.), G. Leggatt (*a*) (Christ's), J. S. Lowe (*a*) (Selw.), R. W. L. Melbourne (*a*) (Selw.), J. B. Phillips (*a*) (Emm.), W. C. Pollard (*a*) (Cai.), C. E. G. Pritchard (*b*) (Christ's), R. A. Rendall (*a*) (Trin.), E. M. Smythe (*a*) (Emm.), R. V. Spivey (*a*) (Trin.), J. F. Swift (*a*) (King's), R. Tunstill (*a*) (Pet.), H. F. P. Wetherell (*a*) (Cath.), J. C. Wheeldon (*a*) (Emm.), T. H. White (*a*) (Queens').

Class III.—R. J. R. Allwork (*a*) (Pemb.), R. W. Angus (*a*) (Cai.), T. B. Baines (*a*) (Corp. Chr.), E. F. Bentley (*a*) (Jes.), W. E. Bridges (*a*) (Christ's), G. R. R. Brown (*a*) (Emm.), E. E. Carter (*a*) (Sid. Suss.), C. B. Cook (*a*) (Jes.), S. Curtis Brown (*a*) (Magd.), C. E. Cuthbertson (*b*) (Queens'), S. Dick (*a*) (Corp. Chr.), J. Downton (*a*) (Queens'), W. D. Galsworthy (*a*) (non-coll.), W. T. D. Harris (*a*) (Selw.), J. A. Hartley (*a*) (Cath.), R. J. C. Howes (*a*) (Jes.), B. B. Jacob (*a*) (Joh.), K. V. Jones (*a*) (Emm.), K. King (*a*) (Christ's), N. B. Larby (*a*) (Down.), S. A. Lockhart (*a*) (Jes.), C. F. E. Lowe (*a*) (Selw.), N. A. L. Miller (*a*) (Queens'), T. H. Musk (*a*) (non-coll.), K. B. Myers (*a*) (Cai.), G. D. Naylor (*a*) (Joh.), F. W. F. Otter-Barry (*a*) (Jes.), M. L. Parry (*a*) (Queens'), C. A. Pollard (*a*) (Pet.), J. E. Prothero (*a*) (Selw.), Hon. W. H. M. Roberts (*a*) (Trin.), A. J. L. Sadlier (*a*) (Emm.), K. P. Sinha (*a*) (King's), Ternent, J. S. (*a*) (Joh.), B. L. Thompson (*a*) (Joh.), R. V. Williams (*a*) (Emm.), T. Woodfine (*a*) (Cath.), N. P. Wright (*a*) (Joh.).

Ægotant.—C. E. R. Clarabut (*a*) (Magd.), F. L. Hamer (*a*) (Christ's), I. Lambe (*a*) (Trin. H.).

WOMEN

Class I.—M. B. Clift (*A*) (Newn.), E. I. Cumming (*A*) (Girton), K. G. G. Davies (*A*) (Newn.), M. M. E. Hammond (*B*) (Newn.), N. R. Head (*A*) (Newn.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* :—M. A. Ash (*a*) (Newn.), G. V. Cohen (*a*) (Girton), F. N. Cowan (*a*) (Girton), L. E. Disney (*b*) (Girton), V. F. Edmonds (*a*) (Girton), A. B. Ewart (*a*) (Girton), W. J. M. Eyles (*a*) (Girton), N. M. Hackwood (*a*) (Girton), Q. D. Roth (*b*) (Girton), A. E. M. Wamsley (*b*) (Newn.). *Div. 2* : H. L. Addison (*b*) (Newn.), K. M. Bloor (*b*) (Newn.), E. Bond (*a*) (Girton), M. G. Davies (*a*) (Newn.), L. H. V. G. Durai (*a*) (Newn.), V. D. Elliott (*a*) (Newn.), P. M. Fletcher (*a*) (Newn.), M. E. Gimingham (*a*) (Girton), A. M. F. Gough (*a*) (Girton), E. Jesse (*a*) (Newn.), M. E. H. V. Jones (*a*) (Girton), E. Kitson (*a*) (Girton), M. A. C. Nutley (*a*) (Newn.), M. E. K. Scott (*a*) (Girton), M. F. Sikes (*a*) (Newn.), C. Thyne (*b*) (Girton), M. Williams (*a*) (Newn.).

Class III.—S. Buckley (*b*) (Newn.), M. Challess (*a*) (Newn.), F. M. R. Grylls (*b*) (Girton), J. E. Jewson (*a*) (Girton), H. Krabbe (*a*) (Girton), E. M. Lloyd (*a*) (Newn.), E. D. Titley (*b*) (Girton).

The letters *a*, *b* appended to the name of a candidate denote the Section or Sections in which he or she has passed (*a*=English Literature, Modern and Medieval; *b*=Early Literature and History). A capital letter denotes that the candidate is placed in the First Class for proficiency in that Section.

An asterisk denotes special distinction.

DURHAM.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Claire J. D. Grece (Arms.).

Class II.—Eleanor W. Bowman (Arms.), Elsa Chilton (Arms.), W. W. Drysdale (Arms.), Millicent F. Ellison (Arms.), Margaret M. Hornsby (Arms.), Doris Mullins (Arms.), Doreen Youll (Arms.).

LEEDS.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Monica Dawn.

Class II.—Hilda Clark, Muriel P. Doddrell, E. A. Doughty, Marjorie H. Gascoigne, Kathleen M. Geraghty, Lucy I. Gill, W. P. Jowett, Evelyn A. Lee, R. H. Lee, Jessie S. Mackenzie, May G. Mather, J. A. Norton, Isabel N. Phillips, Hilda M. Sayer.

Class III.—Helen Carter, Eileen Dobbings, Mary K. Exley, Marguerite Malone.

LIVERPOOL.—English :

Class I.—Eileen M. Hogan, Jane Roberts, Janet V. Whitaker, Gwladys Williams.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Annie E. Brown, Beatrice M. Bunney, W. E. Lloyd, Ada M. McCarthy, Lilian Webster. *Div. 2* : Dorothy B. Bland, Emily Harrison, S. F. Kerry, Mary McCurdy, Margaret R. McFarlin, Dorothy B. Wilson.

LONDON (Internal).—English :

Class I.—A. H. Collins (George Smith Studentship) (King's), W. Joyce (Birkbeck), *W. H. Leese (Birkbeck), Margaret Patterson (King's), Marjorie Phillips (E. L. C.), E. P. Poole (E. L. C.), J. G. Williams (U. C.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : A. G. Berrisford (E. L. C.), Lilian W. Bishop (King's), Isabel B. D. Bromhall (Holloway), G. S. Clyde (U. C.), Kathleen Finch (King's), K. Foster (U. C.), Olive C. E. Hewson (Holloway), Doris V. Ives (Westfield), H. C. Lillicrap (King's), Helen O. Loewenthal (Bedford), L. B. Marshall (U. C.), J. Packman (U. C.), Hilda L. Plummer (Bedford), Elsa J. Rice (U. C.), Stella Strickland (Birkbeck), R. J. Stringer (U. C.), Claire E. Tisdall (King's). *Div. 2* : Alicia M. Adams (King's), Margaret M. Allcock (Westfield), Kate M. L. Barraud (U. C.), D. K. Baxandall (King's), S. S. Bhandarkar (U. C.), Dorothy S. S. Boardman

* Attained Studentship standard but technically disqualified by the regulations for the award of the George Smith Studentship.

(Holloway), Evelyn E. Brown (King's), Iris A. Carbis (Westfield), Dorothea M. Catterall (Bedford), Ruth Clapham (Bedford), Mary L. Currie (Holloway), Ellen Deveson (Westfield), Barbara M. Erith (U. C.), Helen B. M. Fennell (King's), C. C. Fitz-Hugh (King's), Evander M. Foster (U. C.), C. D. Garlick (U. C.), P. W. Gower (King's), Dorothy T. Harris (U. C.), P. R. Heather (King's), Eileen H. Henson (King's), Elizabeth M. Holmes (U. C.), Gwenyth Hubble (U. C.), Isobel M. Hutton (Bedford), Naomi A. Kayser (Holloway), W. H. McCrohan (King's), Ailsa M. McCulloch (U. C.), Phyllis M. Macpherson (U. C.), Kathleen A. Menhinick (Bedford), Katherine A. Mill (King's), R. Moore (King's), Lilian M. Morris (Westfield), A. F. C. Paine (E. L. C.), Doris L. Pearce (Bedford), Doris B. Potts (Westfield), Elizabeth M. Powers (Holloway), Dorothea M. Prescott (Bedford), Doris M. D. Rosling (King's), G. V. Ross (U. C. and Birkbeck), Connie E. Saunders (Holloway), Eva M. Savill (Bedford), Marjorie Snell (U. C.), Kathleen P. White (U. C.): Ella M. Capon (King's).

Class III.—Kathleen M. Barker (E. L. C.), Madge H. A. Collins (Holloway), Marjorie A. Coward (King's), Marie D. V. Cross (Bedford), Kathleen A. Davey (U. C.), Gwendolen Gale (U. C.), Ada S. Hallett (Birkbeck), Mimie D. Handcock (U. C.), Eileen Hare (E. L. C.), Marjorie K. Hennequin (Westfield), Enid M. I. Hobbs (King's), Alma B. E. Jones (E. L. C.), Doris E. E. Lee (U. C.), Audrey McMurtrie (Holloway), W. J. Margerison (King's), Olive Maskell (U. C.), Isla M. Oxley (E. L. C.), Constance M. Parr (Westfield), A. W. Penn (E. L. C.), Doris L. Raffan (E. L. C.), J. F. Ransom (King's), Aileen M. Scorrer (Holloway), Eleanor G. Selby (Bedford), Ada A. Shepherd (King's and Birkbeck), T. W. Smith (U. C.), Nellie D. Taylor (U. C.), Annie D. Wallace (U. C.), Doris M. Weare (U. C.), Joan M. Wilkinson (E. L. C.).

LONDON (External).—English :

Class I.—Annie B. Buckingham (Univ. of Reading), Agnes M. S. Crum (Priv.), Miriam E. Pearce (U. C., South.), Lilian C. Wainwright, B.A. (Southlands Coll., King's and Priv.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Dora C. A. Bourne (Hillside Convent Coll., Farnborough), A. J. Bulman (Priv.), May A. Chaplin, B.A. (Priv.), Dorothy Crossley (U. C., Nott.), W. H. Euston (U. C., South.), W. H. Gibson (Ushaw Coll.), B. W. F. Harvey (Priv.), D. W. H. Jenkins (U. C., Nott.), L. H. Jolly (Univ. of Reading), L. E. Lowe (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), Mollie P. Rippin (U. C., L'ter.), Lilian N. Sweet (Univ. of Reading), H. Whitehall (U. C., Nott.). *Div. 2* : Marjorie E. Batson (U. C., South.), H. J. Chuter, B.A. (Priv.), P. J. Doherty (Priv.), S. F. Downing (U. C., Nott.), P. A. Hall (Priv.), J. F. Hinett (Mid. Inst. Birmingham, and Priv.), H. J. Lillywhite, B.A. (Priv.), Irene J. Macintyre (Priv.), J. Miller (Priv.), F. O'Hara (Priv.), V. C. Osborne (Priv.), L. A. Poore (U. C., South.), R. W. Pratt (Priv.), B. J. Prentis (Priv.), T. G. Randall (Birkbeck), Kathleen M. Rowe (Univ. of Reading), P. J. Rust (Priv.), V. W. Smith (Westminster Coll.), Norah Waddington (U. C., L'ter.), T. Wheeldon (Priv.).

Class III.—Emma O. Allsworth (Priv.), M. Barnett (U. C., Ex.), Kathleen Brookes (Priv.), W. H. Cheatele (Westminster Coll.), Sybil E. Clark (Univ. of Reading), W. E. Collihole (U. C., South.), W. F. Cooper (Priv.), Enid M. Cowles, B.A. (Univ. of Reading and Priv.), Mary M. Gough (Priv.), Winifred K. Klarner (U. C., Nott.), J. L. Lavery (Priv.), Marjorie Lucas (Priv.), H. L. McK. McNabb (Priv.), Rose E. E. Marlow (U. C., Nott.), R. S. Milligan, B.A. (Priv.), W. G. Pearce, B.A. (Priv.), Ursula M. Pye, B.A. (Priv.), Mary I. Rosewarne (U. C., Ex. and Priv.), J. L. Tennant (U. C., Nott.), C. C. Woodley (Borough Rd. Coll.).

MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Florence Ashton, Marjorie Fidler, H. Pashley.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Dorothy Allan, Kathleen M. B. Hay, Meta A. C. J. Hopkins, Edith M. Liptrot, Mary B. Lishman, Rachel N. Pearse, G. E. Thompson, Gertrude M. Turner. *Div. 2* : Millicent M. S. Baylis, J. Cherry, Dora G. Cohen, Edith M. Dix, H. R. Eckroyd, Lily Firth, Phyllis M. Harris, Doris E. Heywood, Vera A. Jaques, S. M. Price, E. R. Wood.

Class III.—Nora Fieldhouse, G. Tindall.

OXFORD.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—J. J. Kavanagh (Camp. Hall), J. B. Leishman (St. John's), Elaine V. V. Clark (L. M. H.), Kathleen M. Constable (Som.), Christine L. Morrison (H.-S.).

Class II.—J. D. Bennett (Oriol), W. P. Black (Keble), J. E. Butt (Mert.), H. Cloke (St. Ed. Hall), A. B. Cochran (C. C. C.), W. Connely (New), J. F. Courage (St. John's), G. B. Dangerfield (Hertf.), N. Dawson (St. Ed. Hall), W. Duncan (Oriol), C. E. Escritt (Keble), P. S. Havens (Univ.), F. W. Johnson (Mert.), C. King (Oriol), J. L. Nevinson (Exeter), A. C. Raby (St. John's), W. N. Roughead (Oriol), R. G. McN. Scott (St. John's), J. D. Shivas (Mert.), G. Tillotson (Ball.) : Norah H. Airey (Som.), Elizabeth J. Batty (H.-S.), Evelyn M. Bowers (H.-S.), Mary M. Champness (H.-S.), Grace C. Chesterman (H.-S.), Joan E. Colborne (L. M. H.), Rhoda D. Coole (Som.), Elizabeth K. Creaswell (Som.), Cecilia A. Dowling (H.-S.), Mary S. Fitch (H.-S.), Mary Guy (H.-S.), Marjorie B. Hall (St. Hug.), Ruby M. Hobling (Som.), Beatrice E. Home (L. M. H.), Mary F. Houlihan (St. Hug.), Edna Hutchinson (Som.), Enid M. Jeeves (Som.), Bridget Johnston (L. M. H.), Winifred E. Murrell (St. Hug.), Muriel G. Orton (St. Hild.), Eileen M. O'Shaughnessy (St. Hug.), Marjorie Reed (L. M. H.), Brenda A. Ritchie (St. Hild.), Monica R. Thring (L. M. H.), Gertrude E. Trevelyan (L. M. H.), Ethel A. Turner (St. Hild.), Lorna C. Watson (Som.).

Class III.—H. A. Ainsworth (Keble), V. M. Allom (Exeter), D. J. Bishop (Wadh.), Hon. D. B. Buckley (Trin.), F. J. Field (St. Ed. Hall), A. S. T. Fisher (Ch. Ch.), H. Franklin (Exeter), F. P. Gass (Pemb.), J. P. Giles (Pemb.), G. E. H. Grigson (St. Ed. Hall), J. Hurd (Hertf.), H. D. MacKay (Ch. Ch.), R. F. Morrison (Pemb.), F. H. D. Pritchard (Oriol), T. H. Sheppard (Mert.), W. A. Smith (Linc.), P. Styles (Worc.), H. R.

Thacker (St. John's), D. G. Williams (Jes.): Mary R. Anderson (H.-S.), Mary E. Bateson (H.-S.), Annie A. M. Brunyate (St. Hug.), Gertrude V. Cope (Som.), Nancy Cozens (St. Hild.), Dorothy Crane (H.-S.), Ursula M. S. Dacombe (St. Hug.), Margaret E. Drake (Som.), Muriel B. Edwards (H.-S.), Isobel A. Evans (St. Hug.), Violet A. Grant (L. M. H.), Mary C. Hill (Som.), Honour N. Humphreys (St. Hug.), Gertrude B. Lacey (St. Hug.), Marjorie P. McNabb (H.-S.), Christine E. M. Ogle (H.-S.), Dorothy V. Pasley (H.-S.), Mary-Ellen B. Russell (St. Hug.), Elizabeth N. Symes (St. Hug.), Alice K. P. Tyacke (St. Hug.), Chloe A. Vulliamy (St. Hild.), Joan M. Wilby (H.-S.), Gwendolen M. B. Williams (St. Hug.).

Class IV.—C. Y. Ball (Linc.), D. K. Daniels (St. Ed. Hall), A. R. Lloyd (non-coll.), A. W. Packard (Mert.), J. G. Southworth (non-coll.), E. W. White (Ball.): Violet V. Daniell (H.-S.), Elinor D. Leslie-Jones (St. Hug.), Daphne F. Martin-Hurst (St. Hug.), Frances H. Moore (St. Hug.), Esther M. Power (St. Hug.), Muriel M. G. Sara (St. Hug.), Morna M. Stuart (H.-S.), Bertha M. Wardell (St. Hug.), Agnes L. Ware (H.-S.).

Ægrotat.—Marian C. T. Nugent (St. Hug.).

Overstanding Satisfied the Examiners.—C. C. Martin (Ch. Ch.).

SHEFFIELD.—English :

Class I.—H. Scarborough.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Kathleen M. Blackburn, R. A. Cowling, Constance Hilton, Katherine Marriage. *Div. 2* : Alma G. Orme, E. Strauss, Eunice Wallis.

Class III.—Mary Cawley, Mary A. Lawson.

WALES.—English :

Class I.—T. F. Bennett (Swan.), W. R. Blainey (Card.), Elsie M. Evans (Card.), C. J. A. Hill (Swan.), Gwyn Jones (Card.), Lilian E. Jones (Ban.), W. A. Jones (Card.), S. G. Pearce (Aber.), Una G. Williams (Swan.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : A. Beddard (Card.), Marjorie E. Cash (Ban.), L. P. C. Dodd (Aber.), A. T. G. Edwards (Card.), Alma S. Elias (Aber.), Gwendoline M. Evans (Aber.), Sarah M. Evans (Swan.), T. D. Gibbs (Aber.), E. Hugh (Card.), Phyllis L. Paxton (Card.), Catherine M. Pritchard (Card.), Enid L. Sayers (Aber.), D. W. Walters (Card.), D. T. Watkins (Card.). *Div. 2* : Gwyneth Enoch (Card.) Gwladys G. Harries (Aber.), Winifred I. Hughes (Card.), Elizabeth M. Hutchings (Aber.), Grace H. James (Card.), Beryl M. Jones (Card.), F. B. Lerigo (Card.), Iris M. Pennington (Card.), Joyce E. Pugh (Card.), Alice N. Ray (Card.), Mary Rees (Card.), T. O. Rees (Aber.), Grace I. Thackwell (Card.), Kathleen W. Williams (Card.).

Class III.—Kate E. Andrews (Aber.), Doris E. Cooksey (Card.), Irene M. Enright (Card.), L. I. Jones (Aber.), Muriel Lewis (Card.), Irene D. Poole (Aber.), D. H. Thomas (Aber.), Amy Westlake (Card.), P. T. Williams (Aber.).

SCOTLAND (M.A.).

ABERDEEN.—English :

Class I.—J. Barber, T. G. Henderson, E. M. Heron, C. MacIennan, T. D. Mowatt, Agnes G. Wishart.

Class II.—Eva M. Cameron, R. A. J. Gossip, Marion D. Hoggarth, Ina Hood, Elizabeth A. Stephen, Laura M. Wilson, Jeannie T. Wisely.

EDINBURGH.—English :

Class I.—G. Clazy, Olive C. Sampson.

Class II.—Edith D. Bell, A. Goldie, Jessie E. Goldsmith, W. Groundwater, Jean Henderson, Sarah H. MacGregor, A. D. Mackie, G. C. Martin, J. T. Ruthford, Gladys M. F. Simmons, Isabella M'K. Suttie, F. J. Wain.

Class III.—R. Sutherland.

M.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

LIVERPOOL.—Josephine Birmingham, Marjorie Lindley, N. R. Tempest, F. West.

WALES.—J. Adams, B.A. (Swan.), Agnes Kamen, B.A. (Calcutta) (Aber.), W. B. Lewis, B.A. (Card.), H. Simons, B.A. (Swan.).

ERRATUM

Page 333, l. 3, for *Add. A. G* read *Add. A. 61*.

INDEX

- About Shakespeare and his Plays*, by G. F. Bradby, reviewed, 244
- "Abridgement," Shakespeare's use of the word, 339
- Act- and Scene-Divisions in the Plays of Shakespeare: a rejoinder to Sir Mark Hunter*, article by J. Dover Wilson, 385
- Addison, Joseph, at Padua in 1700. .75; parallels in Wordsworth, 157; B. Dobrée's essay on (review), 234
- Adventurer, The*, Johnson's part in, 420
- Allan Ramsay's "Poems," 1720, note by R. W. Chapman, 343
- Alerton, Margaret, her *Origins of Poe's Critical Theory*, reviewed, 489
- Amorous Miser, The*, 340
- Amphitruo*, (Plautus), history of, 346
- Andrews, A. le R., and the derivation of the name Hamlet, 258
- Anglo-American Cultivation of Standard English, On the*, article by J. H. G. Grattan, 430
- Anglo-Frisiske, Heruliske og Burgundiske Indskrifter, Om*, by Th. Jørgensen, reviewed, 352
- "Anglo-Saxon," semantic note on, 455
- Annals of the Fine Arts* the source of parts of *Hyperion*, 3
- Another Future of Poetry*, by Robert Graves, noticed, 497
- Arte of English Poesie, The*, parallels with Elyot's *Gouernour*, 41
- Austin (or Augustine), William, Day's dedicatory address to, 281
- Authors Dead and Living*, by F. L. Lucas, reviewed, 120
- Bacchic Element in Shakespeare's Plays, The*, by Émile Legouis, noticed, 376
- Bacon, John, *The Will of*, note by B. M. Ward, 446
- Bailey, John, his *A Question of Taste* noticed, 497
- Baker, Ernest A., reviews by, 85, 227, 361, 479
- Balderston, Katharine C., her *History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith* reviewed, 232
- Ball, Elrington, and authorship of *Jack Frenchman's Lamentation*, 212
- Barfield, Owen, his *History in English Words* reviewed, 120
- Barbarus, Hermolaus, and Plautus's *Amphitruo*, 348
- Bateson, F. W., on *The Amorous Miser*, 340
- Bathurst, Dr. Richard, and *The Adventurer*, 427
- Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*, by A. C. Sprague, reviewed, 370
- Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals, The*, by Walter Graham, reviewed, 368
- Behn, Mrs. Aphra, and Bishop John Wilkins, 450; and Fontanelle's *Pluralité des Mondes*, 451
- Bennett, R. E., on Mrs. Behn's *Emperor of the Moon*, 450
- Beowulf* transl. by Archibald Strong, reviewed, 115; transl. by D. H. Crawford, reviewed, 237
- Berthelet, Thomas (printer), at Waterford, 1517-19. .446
- Bibliographical Correction, A*, note by R. E. Bennett, 450
- Binyon, Laurence, his *Tradition and Reaction in Modern Poetry* noticed, 376
- Birth of Hercules, The*, 348
- Blackman, Mrs. E., reviews by, 115, 237
- Blake, William, *Prophetic Writings*, ed. Sloss and Wallis, reviewed, 99;

- Songs of Innocence and Experience*, ed. Cowling, reviewed, 116
- Blanchard, Frederick T., his *Fielding the Novelist* reviewed, 227
- Boas, F. S., his edit. of *Fulgens and Lucrez* reviewed, 83; his *Year's Work in English Studies* noticed, 493
- Bodleian Library, Shelley correspondence in (review), 110; letters of Bodley to the first librarian (review), 479
- Bodley, Sir Thomas, *The Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James*, ed. G. W. Wheeler, reviewed, 479
- Book of Troilus and Criseyde*, *The*, by Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. R. K. Root, reviewed, 240
- Boyes, Edward, his marriage with Elizabeth Breton, 446
- Bradby, G. F., his *About Shakespeare and his Plays* reviewed, 244
- Bragg, Benjamin, and *The Amorous Miser* (1705), 341
- Breton, Elizabeth, and E. Boyes, 446
- Brettell, Robert E., article on Daniel and the Revels Children, 1604-5.. 162; and on Marston at Oxford, 398; review by, 482
- Brett-Smith, H. F. B., reviews by, 234, 486
- British Museum Quarterly*, *The*, reviewed, 246
- Brittain, F., his edition of the *Lyfe of Saynt Radegunde* reviewed, 372
- Browne, Sir Thomas, prose-rhythm in, 308
- Brusendorff, Aage, his *Chaucer Tradition* reviewed, 80
- Buckingham, Charles Villiers (Duke of), at Padua in 1646.. 75
- Bullen, A. H., his views on *The Parliament of Bees*, and *The Wonder of a Kingdom*, 283, 284
- Byrne, Muriel St. Clare, review by, 481
- Byrom, H. J., article on Tottel's *Miscellany*, 1717-1817.. 47
- Byron, George Gordon (Lord), *Goethe and Byron*, ed. J. G. Robertson, reviewed, 106
- C. P. S., his *Structure of "Wuthering Heights"* noticed, 497
- Campbell, O. J., his views on Wordsworth's *Guilt and Sorrow*, 71
- Canon of Swift*, *The*, notes by C. H. Firth and Harold Williams, 73, 212
- Capital Letters in Elizabethan Handwriting*, *The*, article by R. B. McKerrow, 28
- Casson, T. E., article on Wordsworth and the *Spectator*, 157
- Castle of Indolence*, *The*, R. W. C. on the first edition, 456
- Chambers, Sir Edmund K., on the date of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History*, 332
- Chambers, Robert (cordwainer), and the Court of Orphans, 277
- Chapman, R. W., notes on the numbering of editions in the eighteenth century, 77; on "picked" copies, 79; on Allan Ramsay's *Poems* (1720), 343; on the 1744 edition of *The Pleasures of Imagination*, 349; on the first edit. of *The Castle of Indolence*, 456; review by, 243
- Chapone, Mrs., and *The Adventurer*, 425
- Charlton, Prof. H. B., reviews by, 244, 489
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, reviews of Brusendorff's *Chaucer Tradition* and Ruud's *Thomas Chaucer*, 80; *Troilus and Criseyde*, ed. Root, 240; Manly's *Chaucer and the Rhetoricians* noticed, 376
- Chesterfield, Philip Stanhope (Earl of), at Padua 1651.. 75
- Chevalley, Abel, his *Thomas Deloney* reviewed, 85
- Child Actors*, *The*, by Harold N. Hillebrand, reviewed, 482
- Child, Harold, list of revivals of English dramatic works, 1901-1918, 1926.. 169
- Children of the Queen's Revels, and Samuel Daniel, 162
- Clark, Prof. A. C., on prose-rhythm, 309
- Cokaine, Aston, at Padua 1632.. 75
- Collins, William, *The Letters of William Collins*, article by H. O. White, 12; Mulso's letters concerning him, 12; second visit to Flanders in 1746.. 13; plans for a literary review, 14; letter to John Gilbert Cooper, 14;

- and to Dr. Wm. Hayes, 18; Oxford edit. of the *Ode to the Passions*, and Winchester reprint with interpolation by the Earl of Lichfield, 18, 20
- Colman, George, and *The Adventurer*, 421, 425
- Colophons and Marginalia of Irish Scribes, On the*, by Charles Plummer, reviewed, 239
- Congreve, William, and *Jack Frenchman's Defeat*, 73, 212
- Congreve and America*, note by J. Isaacs, 79
- Cooper, John Gilbert, letter from Colina to, 14
- Copley, Avarey, Esq., and Anne Donne, 275
- Copy of Shakespeare's Works which formerly belonged to Dr. Johnson, A*, note by A. Cuming, 208
- Court of Orphans, and John Donne, 273
- Cowl, R. P., his *Some "Echoes" of Henry IV* noticed, 498
- Cowley, Abraham, text of his *Mistress*, 22
- Cowling, George H., his edit. of Blake's *Songs of Innocence and of Experience* reviewed, 116
- Cowper, Lady, and the canon of Swift, 212
- Crawford, D. H., his translation of *Beowulf* reviewed, 237
- Croll, Prof., on prose-rhythm, 310
- Cruikshank, Prof. A. H., his edition of Massinger's *New Way to Pay Old Debts* reviewed, 480
- Cuming, A., on Dr. Johnson's copy of Shakespeare, 208
- Daniel, Samuel, and the Children of the Queen's Revels, 1604-5*, article by R. E. Brettell, 162; Daniel's answer to Kirkham's Bill of Complaint, 167
- Darbishire, Helen, article on Keats and Egypt, 1
- Dance, Alice, and William Rastell, 446
- Davis, Bernard E. C., reviews by, 99, 116
- Day, John, v. *Parliament of Bees*, 280
- Day, Mabel, on Duns Scotus and *Piers Plowman*, 333; reviews by, 490, 492
- Death of Dr. Robert Levett, On the*, note on, by S. C. Roberts, 442
- Dekker, Thomas, share in *The Parliament of Bees*, 286
- Deloney, Thomas, by Abel Chevalley, reviewed, 85
- Dennis, John, and a letter in *The Champion*, 1814..68
- De Rerum Principio*, and *Piers Plowman*, 333
- De Roman in de 18^e Eeuw in West Europa*, by Dr. J. Prinsen, reviewed, 98
- Detten, F., and the derivation of the name Hamlet, 258
- Dialects of the West Midlands in Middle English, The*, article by Mary S. Serjeantson, 54, 186, 319
- Digby, Kenelm, at Padua 1646..75
- Discourse of English Poetry, The*, indebtedness to Elyot's *Governour*, 40
- Dobrée, Bonamy, his *Essays in Biography* reviewed, 234
- Donne, Anne, her patrimony, 275; marriage with Avarey Copley, 275; and William Lyly, 275
- Donne, Elizabeth, and the Court of Orphans, 273; marriage with Dr. John Symmings, 273; third marriage, 279
- Donne, Elizabeth (the younger), death of, 275
- Donne, Henry, imprisonment and death, 275
- Donne, John (the elder), will of, 272
- Donne, John, *Notes on the Early Life of John Donne*, article by F. P. Wilson, 272; his patrimony, 272; date of birth, 276; his stepfather, 278; date of travels, 279; *Two MSS. of Donne's "Paradoxes and Problems,"* article by Evelyn M. Simpson, 120; *An Undescribed MS. of Donne's Poems*, article by H. J. L. Robbie, 415
- Donne, Katherine, death of, 275
- Donne, Mary, death of, 275
- Doughty, Oswald, reviews by, 95, 363, 366, 473
- Duns Scotus and "Piers Plowman,"* note by Mabel Day, 333

- Earl of Rochester's Grand Tour, The*, note by J. Isaacs, 75
- Earlier and a Later Rolliad, An*, note by R. D. Havens, 218
- Early Tudor Drama*, by A. W. Reed, reviewed, 350; note by W. H. Grattan Flood, 445
- "*Echoes*" of . . . King Henry the Fourth, *Some*, by R. P. Cowl, noticed, 498
- Editions in the Eighteenth Century, The Numbering of*, note by R. W. Chapman, 77
- Egypt, influence on Keats, 1
- Eighteenth Century Verse, Oxford Book of*, reviewed, 487
- Element of Irony in English Literature, The*, by F. McD. Turner, reviewed, 366
- Elia*, a retort to, 68
- Elizabethan Ballad, A Recovered*, note by Prof. Hyder E. Rollins, 335
- Elizabethan handwriting, capital letters in, 28
- Elton, Prof. Oliver, his views on prose-rhythm, 309
- Elyot, Sir Thomas, *Notes on Elyot's "The Governour"* (1531), article by D. T. Starnes, 37
- English, International Council of, 430
- English Language in America, The*, by G. P. Krapp, reviewed, 223
- English Men of Letters at Padua in the Seventeenth Century*, note by J. Isaacs, 75
- English Studies, The Year's Work in*, noticed, 493
- Essays in Biography, 1680-1726*, by Bonamy Dobrée, reviewed, 234
- Essex Place-Names, unfractured forms in the thirteenth century, 453
- Etherege, Sir George, Bonamy Dobrée's essay on (review), 234
- Etymologies for Hamlet*, article by Prof. Kemp Malone, 257
- Evans, B. Ifor, reviews by, 104, 120
- Evans, Henry, and the Revels Children, 162
- Evelyn, John, at Padua 1645..75
- Faber, G. C., on the canon of Swift, 213; his edition of *Gay's Poetical Works* reviewed, 358
- Falstaff and other Shakespearean Topics*, by Prof. Albert A. Tolman, reviewed, 114
- Farewell Folly*, 340
- Field, Nathan, and the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1679*, note by W. W. Greg, 337
- Fielding the Novelist: A Study in Literary Reputation*, by F. T. Blanchard, reviewed, 227
- Firth, Sir Charles H., on the canon of Swift, 73
- Fletcher, Harris, his *Milton's Semitic Studies* reviewed, 356
- Fletcher, John, review of *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*, 370
- Flood, W. H. Grattan, on *Early Tudor Drama*, 445
- Flower, Robin, reviews by, 239, 375
- Forest, William, poet and Petty Canon of Oxford (1546), 445
- Fort, J. A., article on the second series of Shakespeare's Sonnets, 406
- Francis Jenkinson, A Memoir*, by H. F. Stewart, reviewed, 117
- Frere, J. H., *The Monks and the Giants*, ed. Waller, reviewed, 488
- Fulgens and Lucretia*, by Henry Medwall, ed. F. S. Boas and A. W. Reed, reviewed, 83
- Gaelic Studies, Scottish*, reviewed, 375
- Gardiner, B. German (d. 1544), the successor to his estates, 445
- Garrod, Prof. H. W., his *Keats* reviewed, 102
- Gascoigne, George, his wife's former marriage to Edward Boyes, 446
- Gay, John, *Poetical Works*, ed. Faber, reviewed, 358
- Geoffrey of Monmouth's History again, The date of*, note by Sir E. K. Chambers, 332
- German Influence in the English Romantic Period*, by F. W. Stokoe, reviewed, 245
- Gerrard, John, and Samuel Daniel, 1605..163
- Glimpses of Ben Jonson's London*, by N. Zwager, reviewed, 481
- Goethe and Byron*, ed. J. G. Robertson, reviewed, 106

- Golding, S. R., review by, 480
 Goldsmith, Oliver, *The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith* reviewed, 232
 Gollancz, Prof. Sir Israel, and the derivation of the name Hamlet, 259
 Gordon, Prof. E. V., review by, 355
Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions, A, (1578), ed. H. E. Rollins, reviewed, 242
Governour, The (1531), influence in the sixteenth century, 37
 Graham, Walter, his *Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals* reviewed, 368
Grammar of Late Modern English, A, by H. Poutsma, reviewed, 373
 Granville-Barker, Harley, his preface to *King Lear* discussed, 457
 Grattan, J. H. G., article on Anglo-American English, 430; reviews by, 119, 120, 223
 Graves, Robert, his *Another Future of Poetry* noticed, 497
 Greg, W. W., on Nathan Field and the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1679, 337
 Grimald, Nicholas, his classical sources discovered by G. F. Nott, 51
Guilt and Sorrow, note on, 71
Gulliver's Travels, by Jonathan Swift, D.D., ed. H. Williams, reviewed, 466
 Gurrey, P., review by, 373
Gutenberg to Plantin, by G. P. Winship, reviewed, 247
- Hamlet, etymologies for, 257
 Handwriting, Elizabethan, capitals in, 28
 Hanford, J. H., his *Milton Handbook* reviewed, 355
 Harrison, G. B., review by, 114
 Hartog, Sir Philip, his *On the Relation of Poetry to Verse* noticed, 496
Hau Kiou Chooan, A Further Note on, by Alda Milner-Barry and L. F. Powell, 214, 217
 Havens, Prof. Raymond D., on Wordsworth's *Guilt and Sorrow*, 71; on *The Rolliad*, 218
 Hawkesworth, John, and *The Adventurer*, 422 sqq.
- Hawkins, Alexander, and Samuel Daniel, 162
 Hayes, Dr. William, letter from Collins to, 18
 Heitland, W. E., his *Few Words on Verse Translation from Latin Poets* reviewed, 116
 Herford, Prof. C. H., his *Year's Work in English Studies* noticed, 493
 Higgins, John, indebtedness to Elyot's *Governour*, 37
 Hill, R. H., his *Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library* reviewed, 110
 Hillebrand, Prof. Harold N., his *The Child Actors*, reviewed, 482
History of a Latin Comedy, The, note by W. B. Sedgwick, 346
History in English Words, by Owen Barfield, reviewed, 120
Honeyman, John, the Caroline Actor-Dramatist, note by W. J. Lawrence, 220
Hundreth Sundrie Flowres, A (Haslewood edit.), reviewed, 111
 Hunter, Sir Mark, review by, 457
 Husbands, H. Winifred, *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 122, 249, 377, 499
 Huscher, H., his ed. of Page's *Siege of Rouen* reviewed, 492
 Hutchins, Prof. H. C., review by, 466
- "*In Crete when Daedalus first began*," 335
Invective Against Diceplaying, An, and Elyot's *Governour*, 39
Irish Scribes, On the Colophons and Marginalia of, reviewed, 239
Irony in English Literature, The Element of, reviewed, 366
 Isaacs, Jacob, notes on Congreve and America, 79; the Earl of Rochester's Grand Tour, 75; English men of letters at Padua in the seventeenth century, 75; on Shakespeare's "Abridgement," 339; review by, 98
Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England, by E. W. Manwaring, reviewed, 95
- Jack Frenchman's Defeat*, authorship of, 73, 212
 James, Dr. Thomas (first keeper of the

- Bodleian Library), Bodley's letters to (review), 479
- James White, Esq., *A Forgotten Humourist*, article by J. M. S. Tompkins, 146
- Jenkinson, Francis, review of H. F. Stewart's *Memoir*, 117
- Jiriczek, O. L., his views on the derivation of the name Hamlet, 260
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, his copy of Shakespeare's Works used in compiling his *Dictionary*, 208; some notes on Shakespearean readings not printed in his edition of 1765...210; his part in *The Adventurer*, 420; text of *On the Death of Dr. Robert Levet*, 442
- Johnson's Part in "*The Adventurer*," article by L. F. Powell, 420
- Jonson, Ben, *Glimpses of Ben Jonson's London*, ed. Zwager, reviewed, 481
- Jørgensen, Th., his *Om Anglo-Frisiske, Heruliske og Burgundiske Indskrifter* reviewed, 352
- Keats, John, Thorpe's *Mind of John Keats*, reviewed, 104; *Keats*, by H. W. Garrod, reviewed, 102
- Keats and Egypt*, article by Helen Darbishire, 1
- Kendall, Anne, and Samuel Daniel, 163
- Kendall, Thomas, and Samuel Daniel, 162
- Killigrew, Thomas, at Padua 1647-.75 *King Lear* ("The Players' Shakespeare") reviewed, 457
- Kirkham, Edward, and Samuel Daniel, 162; Bill of Complaint, 164
- Krapp, Prof. George Philip, his *English Language in America* reviewed, 223
- Lamb, Charles, and a letter in *The Champion*, 1814..68
- Langland, William, *Piers Plowman* and Duns Scotus, 333
- Late Modern English, A Grammar of*, reviewed, 373
- Lawrence, W. J., on John Honeyman, 220
- Lee, Vernon, his *Poet's Eye* noticed, 497
- Legouis, Émile, his *Bacchic Element in Shakespeare's Plays* noticed, 376
- Levet, Dr. Robert, text of Johnson's elegy, 442
- Lewen, Thomas, his widow and John Donne the elder, 277
- Lichfield, Earl of, his interpolation in Collins's *Ode to the Passions*, 19
- Literary Periodicals, The Beginnings of English*, reviewed, 168
- Lloyd, Bertram, note on *The Noble Soldier* and *The Welsh Ambassador*, 304
- Lovelace, Richard, *Poems*, ed. Wilkinson, reviewed, 89
- Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama*, by Ola E. Winslow, reviewed, 485
- Lucas, F. L., his *Authors Dead and Living* reviewed, 120
- Lyfe of Saynt Radegunde, The*, ed. by F. Brittain, reviewed, 372
- Lynch, Kathleen M., her *Social Mode of Restoration Comedy* reviewed, 486
- Mackenzie, Barbara A., on unfractured forms in thirteenth-century Essex Place-Names, 453
- Malone, Prof. Kemp, article on etymologies for Hamlet, 257; semantic note on "Anglo-Saxon," 455
- Manly, Prof. John M., his *Chaucer and the Rhetoricians* noticed, 376; review by, 350
- Manual of Middle English, Third Supplement*, noticed, 498
- Manwaring, Elizabeth Wheeler, her *Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England* reviewed, 95
- Margoliouth, H. M., review by, 89
- Marston, John, *Dramatist at Oxford*, 1591 (?)–1594, 1609, article by R. E. Brettell, 398
- Marstrander, C. J. S., his views on the derivation of the name Hamlet, 262
- Mason, William, *Satirical Poems*, ed. Toynbee, reviewed, 363
- Massinger, P., *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, ed. Cruickshank, reviewed, 480
- McKerrow, R. B., article on capital letters in Elizabethan handwriting,

- 28; reviews by, 83, 111, 242, 246, 247, 372, 487, 490, 493, 494, 496
- ME. dialects of the West Midlands, 54, 186, 319
- Medwall, Henry, review of *Fulgens and Lucres*, 83
- Melancholy of Tailors, On the*, letter in *The Champion*, 1814..68
- Merrill, Dr. L. R., his discoveries concerning Grimald anticipated by G. F. Nott, 51
- Meyerstein, E. H. W., his transcript of Collins's letter to Cooper, 13, 16
- Milner-Barry, Alda, on *Hau Kiou Choaan*, 214; review by, 232
- Milton, John, Hanford's *A Milton Handbook* reviewed, 355; Fletcher's *Milton's Semitic Studies* reviewed, 356
- Mind of John Keats, The*, by Clarence Dewitt Thorpe, reviewed, 104
- Mirror for Magistrates, The*, indebtedness to Elyot's *Governour*, 37
- Mistress, The*, text of Cowley's poems, 22
- Monks and the Giants, The*, by J. H. Frere, ed. Waller, reviewed, 488
- Morley, Prof. Edith J., review by, 102
- Motteux, Pierre Antoine, attribution of *Farewel Folly*, 342
- Motteux and "The Amorous Muser," note by F. W. Bateson, 340
- Mueschke, Paul, his views on Wordsworth's *Guilt and Sorrow*, 71
- Mulso, Miss (Mrs. Chapone), and *The Adventurer*, 425
- Nash, Paul, his illustrations to *The Players' Shakespeare* discussed, 465
- Nathan Field and the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1679*, note by W. W. Greg, 337
- New Way to Pay Old Debts, A*, Cruickshanks's edition reviewed, 480
- Nicoll, Prof. Allardyce, on Court performances of *The Tempest* in 1674..207; reviews by, 370, 485
- Noble Soldier, The*, 284, 304
- Northbrooke, John, indebtedness to Elyot's *Governour*, 39
- Nott, Dr. G. F., his edition of Tottel's *Miscellany*, 48; discovery of Grimald's classical sources, 51
- Noyes, E. S., his edition of Snollett's letters reviewed, 361
- Ode to the Passions*, Collins's letter to Dr. Wm. Hayes, 18
- Olrik, Axel, his views on Hamlet and the Beowulf legend, 270
- Origins of Poe's Critical Theory, The*, by Margaret Alterton, reviewed, 489
- Orphans, Court of, in the sixteenth century, 273
- Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse, The*, ed. D. Nichol Smith, reviewed, 487
- Oxford, University procedure in the sixteenth century, 398
- Padelford, Prof. F. M., his views on Nott's eds. of Surrey and Wyatt, 48
- Padua, Seventeenth Century English men of letters at, 75
- Page, John, *The Siege of Rouen*, ed. Huscher, reviewed, 492
- Paradoxes and Problems* (Donne), two MSS. compared, 129
- "*Parliament of Bees, The*," article by S. R. Golding, 280; date of publication, 280; date of composition, 281; sources, 283; authorship, 285
- Payne, J., and *The Adventurer*, 422 sqq.
- Payne, Robert, and Samuel Daniel, 162
- Percy, Bishop Thomas, his account of Johnson's method in compiling his *Dictionary*, 209; *Hau Kiou Choaan*, 214; Balderston's *History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith* reviewed, 232
- Periodical literature, summary of, 122, 249, 377, 499
- "*Picked*" Copies, note by R. W. Chapman, 79
- Piers Plowman* and Duns Scotus, 333
- Plautus, history of the *Amphitruo*, 346
- Players' Shakespeare: The Tragedie of King Lear* reviewed, 457
- Pleasures of Imagination, The*, 1744, note by R. W. Chapman, 349
- Plummer, Rev. Charles, his *Colophons and Marginalia of Irish Scribes* reviewed, 239
- Poe, E. A., Alterton's *Origins of Poe's Critical Theory* reviewed, 489

- Post's Eye, The*, by Vernon Lee, noticed, 497
- Pollard, A. W., his *Short-Title Catalogue* reviewed, 494; review by, 117
- Postma, J., his *Tennyson as seen by his Parodists* reviewed, 490
- Poutsma, H., his *Grammar of Late Modern English* reviewed, 373
- Powell, George E. J., 212
- Powell, L. F., on *Hau Kiou Chooan*, 217; article on Johnson's part in *The Adventurer*, 420; reviews by, 368, 488
- Prelude, or Growth of a Poet's Mind, The*, by William Wordsworth, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, reviewed, 473
- Prinsen, Dr. J., his *Roman in de 18^e Eeuw in West Europa* reviewed, 98
- Prophetic Writings of William Blake, The*, ed. D. J. Sloss and J. P. R. Wallis, reviewed, 99
- Queen Elizabeth and a Swedish Princess*, by James Bell, ed. E. Seaton, reviewed, 243
- Question of Taste, A*, by John Bailey, noticed, 497
- Ramsay, Allan, the 1720 edition of his *Poems*, 343
- Rastell, John, in Ireland, 1517-19. .446
- Rastell, William (sixteenth-century printer), marriage with Sir Thomas More's grand-daughter, 446
- Redgrave, G. R., his *Short-Title Catalogue* reviewed, 494
- Reed, A. W., his edit. of *Fulgens and Lucres* reviewed, 83; his *Early Tudor Drama* reviewed, 350; notes on his *Early Tudor Drama*, 445
- Relation of Poetry to Verse, On the*, by Sir Philip Hartog, noticed, 496
- Restoration Comedy, The Social Mode of*, reviewed, 486
- Retort to "Eliä," A*, note by John M. Turnbull, 68
- Revivals of English Dramatic Works, 1901-1918, 1926*, article by Harold Child, 169
- Rhythm in the Prose of Sir T. Browne*, article by N. R. Tempest, 308
- Robbie, H. J. L., article on an undescribed MS. of Donne's poems, 415
- Roberts, S. C., on the text of *On the Death of Dr. Robert Levett*, 442
- Robertson, Prof. J. S., his *Goethe and Byron* reviewed, 106
- Rochester, John Wilmot (Earl of), his *Grand Tour, 1664-75*
- Rolliad, The*, 218
- Rollins, Prof. Hyder E., his edition of *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions* reviewed, 242; note on a "recovered" Elizabethan ballad, 335
- Root, Prof. Robert Kilburn, his edition of *Troilus and Criseyde* reviewed, 240
- Rose, Dr. William, reviews by, 106, 245
- Ruud, Prof. Martin, B., his *Thomas Chaucer* reviewed, 80
- St. Erkenwald*, ed. H. L. Savage, reviewed, 490
- St. John, Henry, Viscount Bolingbroke, at Padua, 1699. .75
- Satirical Poems Published Anonymously by William Mason. With Notes by Horace Walpole*, ed. by Paget Toynbee, reviewed, 363
- Saurat, Prof. D., reviews by, 355, 356
- Savage, H. L., his edition of *St. Erkenwald* reviewed, 490
- Saynt Radegunde, The Lyfe of*, reviewed, 372
- Scottish Gaelic Studies*, ed. by John Macdonald, reviewed, 375
- Scudamore, William (ironmonger), and the Court of Orphans, 277
- Seaton, Ethel, her *Queen Elizabeth and a Swedish Princess* reviewed, 243
- Sedgwick, W. B., on the history of Plautus's *Amphitruo*, 346
- Selincourt, Prof. Ernest de, his edition of *The Prelude* reviewed, 473; review by, 110
- Serjeantson, Mary S., article on the dialects of the West Midlands in *ME.*, 54, 186, 319
- Shadwell and the Operatic "Tempest,"* notes by G. Thorn-Drury and D. M. Walmsley, 204, 451
- Shakespeare, William, the copy of his *Works* used by Dr. Johnson in compiling his *Dictionary*, 208; Act- and Scene-division in the plays, 385; story contained in the second series of the sonnets, 406; Tolman's

- Falstaff and other Shakespearean Topics* reviewed, 114; Bradby's *About Shakespeare and his Plays* reviewed, 244; Legouis' *Bacchic Element in Shakespeare's Plays* noticed, 376; *King Lear* ("The Players' Shakespeare") reviewed, 457
Some "Echoes" of *Henry IV.* noticed, 498
Shakespeare's "Abridgement" in the Light of Theatrical History, note by J. Isaacs, 339
Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library, The, ed. R. H. Hill, reviewed, 110
Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed, 1475-1640, A, by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, reviewed, 494
Siege of Rouen, The, ed. H. Huscher, reviewed, 492
Simpson, Evelyn M., article on *Donne's Paradoxes and Problems*, 129
Skydmore, William (see Scudamore), 277
Sloss, T. J., his edit. of *Blake's Prophetic Writings* reviewed, 99
Smith, David Nichol, his *Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse* reviewed, 487
Smollett, Tobias, *The Letters of*, ed. Noyes, reviewed, 361
Social Mode of Restoration Comedy, The, by Kathleen M. Lynch, reviewed, 486
Soloman, Lawrence, review by, 116
Songs of Innocence and of Experience, by W. Blake, ed. George H. Cowling, reviewed, 116
Sparrow, John, article on the text of *Cowley's Mistress*, 22
Sprague, A. C., his *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*, reviewed, 370
Standard English, Anglo-American cultivation of, 430
Stanhope, Philip, Earl of Chesterfield, at Padua, 1651..75
Starnes, D. T., article on *Elyot's Governour* (1531), 37
Stevens, George, and Johnson's copy of *Shakespeare*, 212
Sternhold, Thomas, successor to the estates of B. German Gardiner, 445
Stewart, H. F., his memoir of Francis Jenkinson reviewed, 117
Stokes, Whitley, his views on the derivation of the name Hamlet, 259
Stokoe, F. W., his *German Influence in the English Romantic Period* reviewed, 245
Story Contained in the Second Series of Shakespeare's Sonnets, The, article by J. A. Fort, 406
Structure of "*Wuthering Heights*," *The*, by C. P. S., noticed, 497
Studies in Prefixes and Suffixes in Middle Scottish, by Elizabeth Westergaard, reviewed, 119
Summary of Periodical Literature, by H. Winifred Husbands, 122, 249, 377, 499
Swift, Jonathan, and *Jack Frenchman's Defeat*, 73, 212; Faulkner's edition of *Gulliver*, 471; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. H. Williams, reviewed, 466
Symmings, Dr. John, and Elizabeth Donne, 273; and the Court of Orphans, 273; life of, 278
Tempest, Norton R., article on rhythm in the prose of Sir Thomas Browne, 308
Tempest, The, Shadwell and the operatic version, 204, 451
Tennyson as seen by his Parodists, by J. Postma, reviewed, 490
Text of Cowley's "Mistress," The, article by John Sparrow, 22
Thirlby, Styan, a former owner of Dr. Johnson's copy of *Shakespeare*, 211
Thomson, James, bibliographical note on first ed. of *The Castle of Indolence*, 456
Thomson, John, Caroline action, 221
Thomson, J. M., his views on *The Noble Soldier*, and *The Parliament of Bees*, 283
Thompson, Sam, Caroline actor, 222
Thorn-Drury, G., on Shadwell and the operatic *Tempest*, 204; his views discussed, 451
Thornton, Bonnell, and *The Adventurer*, 421, 427
Thorpe, Clarence Dewitt, his *Mind of John Keats* reviewed, 104

- Thoyts, Charles, 212
- Tolman, Prof. Albert H., his *Falstaff and other Shakespearean Topics* reviewed, 114
- Tompkins, J. M. S., article on James White, 146
- Tottel's Miscellany*, 1717-1817, article by H. J. Byrom, 47
- Toynbee, Paget, his edition of Mason's poems reviewed, 363
- Tradition and Reaction in Modern Poetry*, by Laurence Binyon, noticed, 376
- Turnbull, J. M., on a retort to *Elia*, 68
- Turner, F. McD., his *Element of Irony in English Literature* reviewed, 366
- Unfractured Forms in Thirteenth-Century Essex Place-Names*, note by Barbara A. Mackenzie, 453
- University Examination Results (1927), 506
- Vanbrugh, Sir John, Bonamy Dobrée's essay on (review), 234
- Vaughan, Thomas, at Padua, 1659..75
- Verse Translation from Latin Poets, A Few Words on*, by W. E. Heitland, reviewed, 116
- Waller, Edmund, at Padua, 1646..75
- Waller, R. D., his edition of Frere's *Monks and the Giants* reviewed, 488
- Wallis, J. P. R., his edit. of Blake's *Prophetic Writings* reviewed, 99
- Walmsley, D. M., his views on Shadwell and the operatic *Tempest* discussed, 204; reply, 451
- Walpole, Sir Edward, his copy of Shakespeare and Dr. Johnson, 211
- Walpole, Horace, notes to satirical poems of Mason (review), 363
- Ward, Capt. B. M., on John Bacon's will, 446; his edit. of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* reviewed, 111
- Warton, Dr. Joseph, and *The Adventurer*, 425 sqq.
- Webbe, William, indebtedness to Elyot's *Governour*, 40
- Welsh Ambassador, The*, 304
- Westcott, Sebastian (d. 1582), Master of St. Paul's Choristers, 446; will of, 483
- Westergaard, Elizabeth, her *Studies in Suffixes and Prefixes in Middle Scottish* reviewed, 119
- West Midland dialects in ME., 54, 186, 319
- Wheeler, G. W., his edition of Bodley's letters to James reviewed, 479
- White, H. O., article on the letters of William Collins, 12
- White, James, article on, 146
- Wilkins, Bishop John, Mrs. Aphra Behn and his *Discovery of a World in the Moon*, 450
- Wilkinson, C. H., his *Poems of Richard Lovelace* reviewed, 89
- Williams, Harold, his attribution to Swift of *Jack Frenchman's Defeat* discussed, 73; on the canon of Swift, 212; his edition of *Gulliver's Travels* reviewed, 466; review by, 358
- Williams, Iolo A., his views on the Winchester edit. of Collins's *Ode to the Passions* (footnote), 20
- Wilmot, John, Earl of Rochester, his *Grand Tour*, 1664..75
- Wilson, F. P., article on the early life of Donne, 272
- Wilson, Prof. J. D., article on act- and scene-divisions in Shakespeare, 385
- Winship, George Parker, his *Gutenberg to Plantin* reviewed, 247
- Winslow, Ola Elizabeth, her *Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama* reviewed, 485
- Wordsworth, William, *The Prelude*, ed. de Selincourt, reviewed, 473
- Wordsworth's "Guilt and Sorrow," note by R. D. Havens, 71
- Wordsworth and the "Spectator," article by T. E. Casson, 157
- Wonder of a Kingdom, The*, 283, 284
- Worgan, John (1724-1790), and Wm. Collins, 19, 21
- Wyatt, A. J., review by, 240
- Year's Work in English Studies, The*, ed. by F. S. Boas and C. H. Herford, reviewed, 493
- Young, Charlotte R. D., review by, 80
- Younger the Wiser, The*, 340
- Zwager, N., his *Glimpses of Ben Jonson's London* reviewed, 481

in
lle
44.
y's
of
ara
rld
ard
to
eat
ift,
vels
the
to
his
life
and
85
ten-
Low
in
ed.
w,"
icle
Nm.
The,
ord,
80
non's

Printed in Great Britain by
William Clowes and Sons, Limited,
London and Beccles.